Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN • LIBRARIES •

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

T
4563
K483
1952

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

T
4563
.K48
1752

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

DAVID ḲIMḤI'S

HEBREW GRAMMAR

(MIKHLOL)

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

DAVID ḲIMḤI'S
HEBREW GRAMMAR
(MIKHLOL)

SYSTEMATICALLY PRESENTED AND CRITICALLY ANNOTATED

BY

WILLIAM CHOMSKY, M.A., PH.D.

Published for

THE DROPSIE COLLEGE FOR HEBREW AND COGNATE LEARNING

by

BLOCH PUBLISHING COMPANY

NEW YORK

1952–5713

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PJ
4563
.K43
1952

Copyright, 1952, by

WILLIAM CHOMSKY

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
PRESS OF Maurice Jacobs INC.
224 N. 15th ST., PHILADELPHIA 2, PENNA.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Near East

Dedicated

TO THE MEMORY OF

MAX LEOPOLD MARGOLIS ז"ל

A GREAT TEACHER, A NOBLE JEW,

AND A PROFOUND SCHOLAR

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

CONTENTS

(Figures in parentheses indicate pages in the Hebrew text, edition Lyk)

PAGE

Translator's introduction.......... vii
List of Abbreviations.......... 1
Names and sources quoted by Ḳimḥi.......... 4
Author's preface.......... 7

CHAPTER I. PHONOLOGY

§ 1. The Consonants: Their Names and Values (69b, 70a, 72b, 73a). 11
§ 2. Transposition of Consonants (Metathesis) (88b to 89b).......... 12
§ 3. Vowel Signs and their Changes (136a to 138b).......... 12
§ 4. The Shewa: Its Character, Function and Use (53b, 138b to 140a).......... 16
§ 5. Dagesh and Rafe (140 a b).......... 18
§ 6. Assimilation and Strengthening of Consonants (70b to 73a, 2b to 3a).......... 19
§ 7. Vowel Letters: Their Function, Influence and Changes (2b, 3a, 57a, 68b, 78a to 83a).......... 22
§ 8. The Tone and Pause (3b, 4a, 5a b, 6a, 9b, 10a, 100a b).......... 26
§ 9. The Change of Vowels, particularly effected by the Position of the Tone (16b, 30b, 58a to 60a, 62b, 68b, 69a, 103a–105b, 143b, 154b, 156b, 181a).......... 28
Notes to Chapter One.......... 30

CHAPTER II. THE PRONOUN

§ 10. The Personal Pronoun (190a to 192a).......... 47
§ 11. The Demonstrative Pronoun (189b, 192a b).......... 48
§ 12. The Article (41a b, 47b, 48a, 83a).......... 49
§ 13. The Interrogative Pronoun (193a).......... 50
§ 14. The Relative Pronoun (40b, 42ab).......... 50
Notes to Chapter Two.......... 51

CHAPTER III. THE VERB

A. The Pure Stem or Ḳal

§ 15. General View (2a to 3a, 4a to 6a, 7b).......... 54
§ 16. The Ground Forms: The Perfect Ḳal (2b to 6a).......... 55
§ 17. The Infinitive (14a b).......... 57

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PAGE

§ 18. The Imperative (14a–16b) 58
§ 19. The Imperfect (16b to 19b, 36b, 37a) 59
§ 20. Lengthening of the Imperfect (Cohortative) (17b to 18b) 61
§ 21. The Perfect and the Imperfect with Waw Consecutive and Waw Copulative (39ab, 41b, 48b to 49b) 62
§ 22. Paradigms and Notes on the Inflexions of the Ḳal (6a to 8a, 9a to 10b, 12a to 13b) 64
Notes to Chapter Three A 73

B. Derived Conjugations

§ 23. Nif'al: Its Function and Essential Characteristics (21b to 23a, 54a to 57b) 82
§ 24. Pi'el and Pu'al (20b, 22b, 23a, 53b, 57a, 58a to 63a) 85
§ 25. Hif'il and Hof'al (23a, 63a to 67a) 89
§ 26. Po'el (23b, 24b, 25a, 53a b, 67a to 68a) 92
§ 27. Hithpa'el (23b, 24a, 68a to 70b) 93
Notes to Chapter Three B 96

C. Strong Verb with Pronominal Suffixes

§ 28. In General (25a, 28a) 108
§ 29. The Pronominal Suffixes of the Verb (25a to 29a) 110
§ 30. The Perfect with Pronominal Suffixes (5a, 18a b, 25b to 27b, 28b, 29a) 112
§ 31. The Infinitive with Pronominal Suffixes (32a to 33a) 113
§ 32. The Imperative with Pronominal Suffixes (25a, 33b to 34b 133a) 114
§ 33. The Imperfect with Pronominal Suffixes (25a, 34b to 36b, 53b, 54a, 74b) 115
Notes to Chapter Three C 118

D. The Weak Verb

§ 34. Verbs Primae Radicalis Nun (פ״ן) (73b to 77b) 121
§ 35. Verbs פ״א (83b to 86a) 124
§ 36. Verbs פ״י (73b, 77b, 78a, 86a to 88b, 91a to 98b, 156a) 128
§ 37. Verbs ע״ו or ע״י (7a, 98b to 111a) 136
§ 38. Verbs ע״ע (40b, 127a to 134a) 147
§ 39. Verbs ל״א (123a to 127a) 155
§ 40. Verbs ל״ה (19a, 32a, 111a to 118a, 119b to 123a) 160
§ 41. Verbs ל״ה with Suffixes (30a, 118a to 119a, 121a) 172
§ 42. Quadriliterals (134a to 135b) 174
Notes to Chapter Three D 177

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PAGE

CHAPTER IV. THE NOUN

A. In General

§ 43. General View (38a, 136a, 140b, 142b)....................218
§ 44. Gender and Number (140b to 142b)....................218
§ 45. Structural Indications of Gender and Number in Nouns (10b to 12a, 13ab, 147b)....................220
§ 46. The Pronominal Suffixes of the Noun (27a, 29b, 30a, 143b to 145a, 147a b)....................223
Notes to Chapter Four, A....................226

B. Masculine Nouns

§ 47. Simple Formations (143a to 152b)....................233
§ 48. Intensive Formations (148a, 152b to 153b)....................240
§ 49. Formations with a Long Unchangeable Vowel (29b to 31a, 149a b, 154a to 156a)....................242
§ 50. Formations with Unchangeable Vowels (153b to 155a, 156a b).244
§ 51. Less Frequent Formations (155b to 157a, 159b)....................245
Notes to Chapter Four, B....................248

C. Feminine Nouns

§ 52. Formations with Changeable Vowels (157b to 159a)....................258
§ 53. Formations with One or More Unchangeable Vowels (159a to 160b)....................260
§ 54. Segolate Nouns (160b to 162a)....................262

Notes to Chapter Four, C

D. Nouns with the Afformatives and the Tone on the Ultima

§ 55. Nouns terminating in וּת— or ִית— which are Unchangeable in the Singular Flexions (161b to 162a)....................269
§ 56. Nouns with Terminations in Nun or Mem (162a to 163a)..270
§ 57. Nouns with One or Two of the Radicals doubled (163a b)...272
Notes to Chapter Four, D....................274

E. Nouns with Preformatives

§ 58. Nouns with Preformed מ (163b to 166a)....................277
§ 59. Nouns with Preformed ת (166a b)....................280
§ 60. Nouns with Other Preformatives (166b to 167b)....................281
Notes to Chapter Four, E....................283

F. Nouns Derived from Weak Stems

§ 61. Formations of the פ״ן Stem with the First Radical assimilated or dropped (167b)....................286

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PAGE

§ 62. Formations of the פ״י Stem, with the First Radical quiescent or omitted (167b to 169a) 286
§ 63. Formations of the Stem ע״ו and ע״י (169a to 172b) 288
§ 64. Formations of the Stem ע״ע (133a, 181a to 183b, 192b) 292
§ 65. Formations of the Stem ל״א (179b to 181a) 295
§ 66. Formations of the Stem ל״ה (172b to 179b) 296
§ 67. Quadriliterals and Quinqueliterals (184a b) 304
§ 68. Peculiar Nouns (185a) 306
Notes to Chapter Four, F 307

G. Numerals

§ 69. Cardinal Numbers (38b, 39a, 185a to 188a) 321
§ 70. Ordinal Numbers (186a to 188a) 324
Notes to Chapter Four, G 325

CHAPTER V. THE PARTICLES

§ 71. General View (188b) 328
§ 72. Adverbs (46b, 47a to 48b, 189a b, 191a, 192a to 194a) 328
§ 73. Conjunctions and Interjections (189b to 190a, 192b, 193b) 330
§ 74. Prepositions (185a, 188b to 191a, 193a b) 330
§ 75. Prefixed Prepositions (38 a b, 39b to 40b, 41b, 48 a b, 193a) 332
§ 76. Prepositions with Pronominal Suffixes (191a, 192a b, 194a) 335
Notes to Chapter Five 336

CHAPTER VI. SYNTACTICAL REMARKS

§ 77. On the Tenses (37a b) 340
§ 78. On the Infinitive (31a to 32a) 341
§ 79. On the Imperative (15b) 342
§ 80. Cognate Accusative (39a, 61a) 343
§ 81. Transitive and Intransitive Verbs (20a to 21b) 344
§ 82. Incongruence of Person, Gender and Number (2a, 6b, 7a, 8a b, 12a, 19b, 20a, 52b, 53a) 345
§ 83. The Function of the Pronominal Suffixes (25a b, 28a) 348
§ 84. Peculiarities of the Construct State (194a b) 349
§ 85. The Function of the Prepositions (41b, 42a, 45a to 46a, 194a) 349
§ 86. The Function of the Waw (39a, 44a to 45a) 352
§ 87. Interrogative Sentences (47a) 354
§ 88. The Function of the Definite Article (42b, 43a, 48a) 354
§ 89. Ellipses in Hebrew (8b, 44a, 50a to 52b) 356
§ 90. Syntactical Transpositions (89b to 91a) 358
Notes to Chapter Six 361
Additions and Corrections 373
Index of Subjects 379
Index of Hebrew Words and Forms 389
Index of Biblical passages 421

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

INTRODUCTION

DAVID ḲIMḤI AND THE AGE OF HEBREW GRAMMAR

The medieval period of Jewish history in Spain has been justly hailed as the Golden Age of Jewish literary creativity. Its poets and philosophers occupy a place of magnificent prominence in the history of Jewish culture. It bequeathed to the Jewish people intellectual and spiritual riches which have served as beacons of light on the road of Israel's subsequent pilgrimage.

The outstanding literary achievement of that period, however, was in the rather prosaic field of Hebrew philology and grammatical science. The zeal, industry, and accomplishments in this field have not since been rivalled. Hebrew grammar seems to have been the pivotal and all-absorbing scholarly interest among Jewish intellectuals of all walks of life. The period may therefore also be designated as the "Age of Hebrew Grammar."

The tenth century marked the turning point in Hebrew and biblical studies. Original research efforts in the Masorah had reached their high watermark in the works of Ben Asher, an older contemporary of Saadia (882–942). The vowel-system then became definitely established, with the Tiberian system[1] predominating. Students of Hebrew

[1] This is our vowel-system, the authorship of which is generally traced to the school of the Masoretes who flourished in Tiberias during the seventh and eighth centuries, C. E.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

thereupon began to direct their attention to purely grammatical problems, without regard to their implications for biblical exegesis.

Occasional grammatical observations are to be found already in the Talmud and the Midrashim. Thus, the rabbis observe[2] that the ending ָה in such forms as מִצְרַיְמָה, חוּצָה, etc. indicates direction and stands in place of a prefixed ל, as למצרים, לחוץ, etc. In another instance[3] it is pointed out that the particle כִּי has four different meanings: *if*, *lest*, *indeed*, *because*. The masoretic notes and comments, likewise, contain a number of significant grammatical remarks. Considerable grammatical material is to be found in the *Sefer Yeṣirah*, an ancient kabbalistic work. But it was not until Saadia that Hebrew grammar was treated as an independent science, and not merely as an aid to the clarification of biblical texts. This versatile scholar laid the foundation for the scientific movement in Hebrew philology. Although most of his grammatical works were lost many centuries ago, his observations on grammar have come down to us through the works of his successors, who quoted him extensively, especially through the commentaries and grammatical writings of Ibn Ezra, who revered him and regarded him as the "chief spokesman everywhere" (ראש המדברים בכל מקום).[4]

Saadia was prompted to undertake the task of writing Hebrew grammar, as he himself testifies in his introduction to his *Agron*, because he was irked by the ignorance of the

[2] Yeb. 13b. [3] Git. 90a.
[4] Introduction to *Mosnayim*.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

language and disregard for grammatical accuracy among the Hebrew writers and poets of his day. His work was, accordingly, designed to guide and aid these writers in the correct use of the language.

As long as the writers confined themselves to conventional themes, such as liturgical compositions and legal discourses, the available vocabularies, idioms, and word-forms in the Bible and the Talmud were adequate and could be readily employed as vehicles for self-expression. When, however, the writers began to deviate from conventional themes, whether because of the influence of Arabic culture in medieval Spain or as a result of independent creative urges, a departure from the stereotyped linguistic pattern became essential. New words had to be coined and new word-forms had to be constructed. Since Hebrew was no longer the vernacular of the people, a knowledge of Hebrew grammar proved indispensable. Even some of the grammarians of that period fell occasionally into glaring etymological errors, as will be shown later, and were criticized severely on that account by their colleagues.

As time went on, the philological movement initiated by Saadia, gathered momentum and grew apace, especially under the spur of Arabic philological pursuits and the urge for literary and religious expression in Hebrew. The rise of the Karaite sect (toward the end of the eighth century) which rejected rabbinic tradition as expressed in the Talmud and emphasized the diligent scrutiny of the Bible as a basis for its tradition, was also a significant factor in focusing the attention of Hebrew scholars on a more searching study of the language of the Bible. The knowledge of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Hebrew grammar, consequently, became a vital need at that time. Grammatical accuracy served as a criterion for the recognition of the merits of literary and religious compositions, and grammatical knowledge constituted the measure of Jewish learning and scholarship. Interest in Hebrew grammar was, therefore, not confined to professional grammarians, but gained vogue among statesmen, poets and philosophers. Samuel ha-Nagid, Judah ha-Levi, Ibn Gabirol and others, all concerned themselves with Hebrew grammatical problems to a greater or lesser degree and wrote about them more or less extensively. Ibn Gabirol wrote a grammatical work in verse, entitled *'Anaḳ* (Necklace).

The study of Hebrew grammar as an independent science was pursued with zeal and profundity by Saadia's successors. An important lexical work by Menaḥem ben Saruḳ, entitled *Maḥbereth*, inaugurated Hebrew grammatical research on Spanish soil and provoked a vehement attack by a pupil of Saadia, Dunash ben Labrat, a brilliant grammarian. Dunash pointed out a great many errors in Menaḥem's work, and he advanced views which already forecast the triliteral theory, later scientifically and systematically expounded by Yehuda Ḥayyuj (ca. 1000 C. E.), one of Menaḥem's disciples. This theory postulates that all Hebrew words have as their basis a stem consisting of three consonants, which are called radicals. All the predecessors of Ḥayyuj, with the exception of Dunash,[5] operated with the

[5] Comp. *Teshuboth Dunash against Menaḥem*, 30, where he identifies the *Waw* in הוגעתם Mal. 2:7 as representing the *Yod* radical, and where he also refers the form יֵבוֹשׁ Hos 13:15 to the stem יבש, in which instance the *Yod* stands, in his opinion, for both the preformative and the initial radical. Similar references may be drawn from his statements on pp. 16 f., 20, 23 and 26.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

idea of biliteral and even uniliteral stems, which are obtained by removing all the suffixes and prefixes. Thus, for example, in וַיֵּט (form of נטה), the stem would be only ט, since this letter alone remains after the prefixes have been removed. Similarly in the case of אֹפֶה (I shall bake), the פ is the only consonant which remains permanently in the inflections and is, therefore, the only stem letter. These grammarians failed to recognize the special character of the assimilated verbs, such as the פ"ן (נשק) in which the *Nun* with *Shewa* is dropped and assimilated to the subsequent letter, as is indicated by the *Dagesh* in this letter (e. g. יִשַּׁק for יִנְשַׁק). Nor were they able to comprehend the nature of the weak verbs, such as have one of the letters אהו"י as a radical.

Although Ḥayyuj's view was universally accepted by subsequent grammarians, his disciples diverge in their interpretation of the master's views. Nor was his triliteral theory consistently adopted. The versatile and brilliant statesman, soldier and poet, Samuel ha-Nagid (11th century) found time amidst his multifarious duties and occupations to engage in verbal clashes on grammatical issues with the profound grammarian Ibn Janah and to write, according to Ibn Ezra's testimony, twenty-two books of "supreme quality" (ואין למעלה ממנו)[6] on Hebrew grammar. The monumental works of Ibn Janaḥ, who was a physician by profession, have been preserved, while those of the Nagid were lost. Fortunately, a few fragments were recently discovered. A number of quotations from his writings are

[6] Comp. Yesod Mora, chap. 1 and Introduction to *Moznayim*. In *Moznayim* Ibn Ezra refers to a book ספר העשר by Samuel ha-Nagid. But according to Bacher in his introduction to Ibn Janah's *Sefer ha-Shorashim*, p. 17, this is a collective title for the Nagid's "twenty-two books."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

also to be found in the works of Ibn Ezra and others. But even from these fragmentary remains it is evident that he was an exceedingly ingenious grammarian. In point of fact, some of his grammatical theories anticipate very important discoveries in Hebrew grammar recently made; such as, for example, the passive of the *Ḳal* (קוּטַּל);[7] the character of the so-called ל״ה verbs, in which he correctly recognized the *Yod* as the third radical; and the like.

The grammatical controversy between Ibn Janah and Samuel ha-Nagid is recounted at some length in the writings of some of the medieval Hebrew grammarians.[8] Samuel ha-Nagid apparently aroused by Ibn Janaḥ's criticism of some of the views of his teacher, Yehudah Ḥayyuj, sent a messenger from Granada to Saragossa, the place of Ibn Janaḥ's residence, charged with the task of challenging Ibn Janaḥ to a verbal duel on certain grammatical issues and of exposing publicly the "fallacy" of his theories. On his arrival in Saragossa, the messenger stayed at the home of a communal leader in that city, named Abu Soleiman ben Taraka, a friend of Ibn Janaḥ. A public reception was arranged in honor of the visitor, to which Ibn Janaḥ was invited. The latter, without suspecting the chief purpose

[7] The prevailing view among the grammarians that the *Nif'al* is the passive of the *Ḳal* has been disproved by modern grammarians. On the basis of comparative Semitics modern grammarians have discovered that such forms as יֻלַּד Gn 18:4 and יֻקַּח ibid 46:27 are really the normal passive forms of the *Ḳal*, many examples of which are found in the Bible and even in talmudic Hebrew. Because of the obscurity of the Nagid's works, these grammarians had to rediscover some very important theories which had already been discovered long ago. Comp. below p. VII and note 147.

[8] Comp. *Opuscules d'Abau'l-Walid*, 344 ff.; also Ibn Barun, *Kitab al-Muwazana*, ed. Kokowzoff, 12. Reference to this controversy is also found in Parḥon's Introduction to his *'Aruk* as well as in Ibn Tibbon's Introduction to Ibn Janah's *Riḳma*.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

of the gathering, accepted the invitation. During the reception, the visitor began to inveigle Ibn Janaḥ gradually and subtly into a discussion. Some of the questions raised by him were readily disposed of and adequately answered by Ibn Janaḥ. But others followed, and Ibn Janaḥ, unprepared for this barrage of questions, was befuddled, and he promised to reply at some future time.

He did so and sent his reply to the visitor. The latter, however, superciliously remarked that it would be wiser for Ibn Janaḥ to withhold his reply until the Nagid's book was published, where he would find even more serious criticisms leveled against him. This Ibn Janaḥ refused to do. He issued his reply in book form and called it *Kitab at-Taswiya*. After the publication of the Nagid's attack on him, Ibn Janaḥ retorted with a violent counter-attack in a book, which he called *Kitab at-Tashwir*. Ibn Janaḥ was very proud of this book, and he frequently referred to it in glowing terms,[9] but, unfortunately, only a fragment of it is now extant.

One of the points at issue in the controversy between Ibn Janaḥ and Samuel ha-Nagid was the case of the *Pu'al* as the passive of the *Ḳal*. According to Ibn Janaḥ, the forms נֻטַּשׁ and עֻזַּב Is 32:14, לֻקַּח Jr 29:22, זֻנָּה Ez 16:34, רֻאּוּ Jb 33:21, יֻלַּד Gn 46:27, etc., the *Pi'el* of which forms either does not occur or has a different meaning, are all to be construed as passives of the *Ḳal*. But the future of the passive *Ḳal*, he maintained, is the same as that of the *Pu'al*, the passive of the *Pi'el*, namely, יְנֻטַּשׁ, יְעֻזַּב, etc. Hence, forms like יֻקַּח Gn 18:4, and יֻתַּן Lv 11:38

[9] See *Sefer ha-Shorashim* s. vv. אהב, החל, יכח, ילד, לקח, נדד, נתן, צפן, פשט.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

cannot be taken as passive *Ḳal*, but rather as *Hof'al* forms.[10] Samuel ha-Nagid, on the other hand, regarded the last two forms also as passive *Ḳal*.[11] In this case Ibn Janaḥ was in error, and Samuel ha-Nagid displayed a keener insight into the nature of this conjugation, as we have learned from comparative Semitics. The theory of the existence of a passive *Ḳal* in Hebrew was revived and systematically elaborated in modern times, independently of the older Hebrew grammarians, by Boettcher[12] and, particularly, by Barth.[13]

Let us return however to the above-mentioned session. Another subject of dispute raised there was the case of וַיִּישֶׂם Gn 50:26 and יִיסָךְ Ex 30:32. Ḥayyuj had once rejected as "remote"[14] the view suggested by some (יש אומרים) that וַיִּישֶׂם was a passive form and that the *Ḥireḳ* under the *Yod* was in place of *Shureḳ* (וַיּוּשַׂם). Ibn Janaḥ, on the other hand, had recognized the plausibility of this view and suggested that יִיסָךְ was to be similarly construed[15] and in support of his etymology, had adduced other examples, where the *Ḥireḳ* replaced the *Shureḳ* or *Ḳibbuṣ*. During the argument at this session on this point the visitor from Granada challenged Ibn Janaḥ's view, and he stated that in his hometown Ḥayyuj's opinion was favored. Ibn Janaḥ replied by corroborating his etymology on the basis of additional evidence and numerous examples in the

[10] Comp. *Opuscules*, 33 ff. and 260; also *Riḳma*, ed. Goldberg, 92.
[11] See *Moznayim*, 33 and *Mikhlol*, ed. Lyk 62b.
[12] Comp. §§ 904 and 1022.
[13] Comp. "*Das Passive Kal und seine Participien*" in the *Festschrift . . . Hildesheimer*, Berlin, 1890. 145 ff.
[14] Comp. *Ḥayyuj*, ed. Nutt. 57.
[15] Op. cit. 32; see also below, notes 212 and 219.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Bible, where *Ḥireḳ* occurs in place of *Shureḳ* or *Ḳameṣ* (short).[16]

Most of the modern grammarians are in agreement with Ibn Janaḥ in this particular issue, and some regard the form as a passive *Ḳal* (*Ḳutal*).[17] Others, however, question the correctness of this reading.[18] The interchange of *Ḥireḳ* and *Ḳibbuṣ* or *Shureḳ* is certainly quite common both in the Bible and in the Talmud;[19] and S. Pinsker seems to be correct in his assumption, based on plausible evidence drawn from ancient masoretic and grammatical sources, as well as from Arabic, to the effect that the *u* sound in the Palestinian pronunciation resembled the French *u* and the German *ü*, with the predominance of *i*.[20]

Most of the works on Hebrew grammar were written at that time in Arabic and were, therefore, inaccessible to the Jewish scholars of France, Italy and Germany. But that traveling scholar, Abraham ibn Ezra (1167), served as the intermediary, and through his copious writings and commentaries, he popularized the ideas of the Spanish Hebrew grammarians among the Jews of the non-Arabic speaking countries. The translations into Hebrew of Ḥayyuj's work by Ibn Chiquitilla and of Ibn Janaḥ's works by Judah ibn Tibbon, also aided in the dissemination of

[16] Ibid. 370 ff.

[17] Comp. Ewald § 131d; Boettcher § 460; Tuch and Dalman on Gn 24:33; Barth, op. cit., 151, note 1; Lambert § 1052.

[18] Comp. Ges.-K. § 73 f.

[19] Comp. Yalon H. *Ḳiriath Sefer* IV, 136 and *Leshonenu* III, 307, also H. L. Ginsburg, *Tarbiz* V, 208 note 1. See also Dalman, *Grammatik des Juedisch Palestin-Aramaisch*, 53 f.

[20] Cf. *Mabo*, 153 ff., note 103; see also below, note 16, and a more elaborate treatment in my article "*Some Irregular Formations in Hebrew*", *JQR*, N. S., XXXVIII, 4, p. 14 ff.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

grammatical knowledge among the Jews of these countries. The subsequent grammatical works of outstanding merit during the medieval period were nearly all written in Hebrew.

These philological pursuits reached their culmination in the writings of the Ḳimḥi family, especially those of the younger member, David (1235), popularly called Radaḳ (רד"ק). His works, though inferior in originality and profundity to those of Ḥayyuj and Ibn Janaḥ, eclipsed and displaced almost entirely the works of these masters. Even so thorough a grammarian as Koenig made constant reference to David Ḳimḥi in his *Lehrgebäude der Hebr. Sprache* as recently as fifty or sixty years ago. As an indication of the esteem in which Ḳimḥi was held by posterity we may cite the following Mishnic dictum which was applied to his works: אם אין קמח אין תורה,[21] and which was interpreted in the sense of "without the works of Ḳimḥi no knowledge of the Torah is possible." His comprehensiveness, simplicity, conciseness, and systematic organization, are chiefly responsible for the popularity of his works. His main contribution to Hebrew grammar was the development and systematization of the theory originated by his father, Joseph, relative to the subdivision of the vowels into five long and five short vowels. The Ḳimḥian theory placed the study of the Hebrew phonetics on a scientific basis, and although its essential features have been disavowed by the modern grammarians on historical-comparative grounds, the theory is very useful pedagogically because it helps explain vowel changes in Hebrew.[22] Without the

[21] Abot 3.21.

[22] See below, § 3 and notes 11 and 19.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ḳimḫian system the whole scheme of vocalization lacks a rational basis. "The division of the vowels in respect of quantity is a later attempt at a scientific conception of the phonetic system, which was not invented but only represented by the Masoretes."[23]

According to the Ḳimḫian theory of vowels, the five short vowels occur in a closed syllable, while the five long vowels occur in an open syllable. Under the influence of the accent, the case may be reversed; that is, short vowels may occur in open syllables and long vowels in closed syllables, e. g. מֶ֫לֶךְ, דָּבָר, אֱלֹהִ֫ים etc. However, this theory led the Ḳimḫians and the subsequent grammarians who accepted their theories into a pitfall. Since long vowels are found in closed syllables, or are followed by *Shewa*, in which case they are protected by a *Metheg*, (e. g. נְבֽוּלְךָ, הָֽיְתָה, etc.), the Ḳimḫians assumed that in all such cases the *Shewa* is vocal, hence the syllable is really open. They thus established the rule, commonly accepted by the modern grammarians, that a *Shewa* following a long unaccented vowel is vocal.[23a] However, S. Baer already disproved this theory on the basis of the accents, as well as authentic grammatical sources.[24] Baer correctly maintains that every *Shewa*, preceded by any of the vowels is silent, except when it occurs under a laryngeal, or under the first of the same two consonants in succession, in which case it is designated by an additional vowel (*Ḥaṭef*), e. g. הַמְשֽׁוֹרְרִים וְהַשֹּׁעֲרִים Ne 12:45, נַֽהֲרֵי נַחֲלֵי Job 20:17, etc.[25]

[23] Ges. K. § 8, preliminary remark.
[23a] Cf. below § 3c.
[24] *Torath Emeth*, 9, note **.
[25] Cf. below, note 19.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The reliability of our vowel-system as an authentic representation of Hebrew pronunciation has been seriously challenged by some modern students of the Masora, principally Paul E. Kahle and A. Sperber. The medieval Masoretes adapted the text of the Bible, according to Kahle, under Arabic and Syriac influences, to some "ideal pronunciation of Hebrew."[25a] They introduced Ḥaṭef vowels, a number of final vowels, as well as the double pronunciation of *bgdkft*, all of which were mere inventions for the purpose of reconstructing the "ideal" pronunciation, which was, in their opinion, that of the classical period. "Only a Bible text, which is edited on the basis of manuscript evidence alone, without editorial interference, can be regarded," according to Sperber, "as a solid foundation of Hebrew philology."[25b] These scholars, consequently, invalidate the grammatical principles laid down by the medieval grammarians and, by inference, the accepted pronunciation of Hebrew.

But the available manuscripts merely furnish evidence of the pronunciation of Hebrew at about the time of the early masoretic activity, and there is no reason to adopt the pronunciation of a language at a given time and locality as "a solid foundation of Hebrew philology." Our masoretic text may be a schematic representation of Hebrew pronunciation, but it has set a pattern for Hebrew, which has been sanctioned by a tradition of many centuries and has influenced the progress of the language. It is therefore legitimately accepted as the pronunciation of the Hebrew language, despite local variations.

[25a] Cf. *The Cairo Geniza*, London, 1947, p. 108.
[25b] See *Hebrew Grammar, A New Approach*, *JBL*, LXII, p. 137.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

David Ḳimḥi is to be noted particularly for his progressive and vital attitude toward the development of the Hebrew language. Beside taking cognizance frequently of the grammatical forms and constructions found in post-biblical literature, he often sanctions and suggests the creation and coinage of new forms and conjugations as long as they conform to the pattern of the Hebrew language and its grammar. Thus, he criticizes the grammarians, including his own father, for objecting to the use of the word הֵקִיץ in the transitive sense in the liturgical formula הַמֵּקִיץ נִרְדָּמִים and for attacking an "eminent linguist" (Moshe ibn Ezra) because he uses this conjugation in the same sense in one of his poems. David Ḳimḥi maintains that since there is no other form of this stem in the transitive it is perfectly legitimate to use it both in the transitive and the intransitive sense, although it does not occur in the transitive in the Bible.[26] He also proposes the coining of new paradigms, whenever needed, if some suggestive basis for such coinage can be found either in the Bible or in the Talmud. He even sanctions the use of such imperative forms as פּוֹל (stem נפל) and דּוֹר (stem נדר), which occur in the Talmud, but are contrary to the rules of biblical Hebrew grammar.[27] On further new coinages by Ḳimḥi see references in the index.

Ḳimḥi himself made no claim to originality. In the introduction to his Hebrew Grammar he modestly assumed the role of a "gleaner after the reaper," whose task it was to compile and present succinctly and simply the voluminous scientific findings of his predecessors. But Ḳimḥi was more

[26] Comp. below, § 81 f.
[27] Cf. below, § 34g.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

than a mere compiler. He was thoroughly conversant with the entire range of Hebrew language and literature. He had a fine sense of system and organization, deep insight into the language and its structure, and splendid critical acumen. All this equipment stood him in good stead in his undertaking. In an independent and rigorous manner he examined and evaluated the rich harvest of the grammatical research of his predecessors, presenting it systematically and concisely, selecting and rejecting, advancing some original ideas and adding some grammatical material of his own.[28]

Since David Ḳimḥi's works mark the closing of the "Golden Era" of Hebrew medieval philology, it might be appropriate to pause here and summarize briefly the contributions of the medieval Hebrew grammarians to the science of Hebrew grammar in general and broad outlines.

One of the most notable and helpful contributions in the field of Hebrew grammar is, undoubtedly, the triliteral theory as presented by Ḥayyuj. This theory shed significant light on the nature and structure of the Hebrew language, particularly as related to the assimilated verbs (פ"ן) and the weak verbs. Without an understanding of the character of these verbs, Hebrew writers were groping in the dark whenever they ventured to turn aside from the set models and familiar constructions found in the Bible or in the Talmud. Witness some of the flagrant errors in verbal and nominal constructions to be found in the works of the early Paytanim. Ḥayyuj criticizes his own teacher,

[28] On the extensive use which later grammarians and lexicographers made of Ḳimḥi's works see Jacob Tauber, *R. David Kimchi*, Breslau, 1867, p. 9, note 1.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Menaḥem ben Saruḳ, for employing erroneously the infinitive forms בצרותו (for ביצרו, stem יצר) and לעוד (for לעדות, stem עדה) because he failed to understand the character of these weak verbs.[29] The significance of this theory in promoting the progress of the study of the Hebrew language can hardly be overestimated. It enabled the grammarians to envisage the Hebrew language as a design in which the structure of nouns and verbs fitted in a perfect mosaic fashion. Later grammarians differed with Ḥayyuj in regard to minor details of this theory.[30] But these minor differences of opinion do not detract from the tremendous significance of this theory in explaining the nature of the Hebrew verbs, particularly, those of the assimilated (פ"ן) and weak verbs.

Another significant contribution by the medieval grammarians is the arrangement of the paradigms in the various conjugations. In order to appreciate the significance of this contribution one must bear in mind the fact that Hebrew, like all Semitic languages, is a consonantal language; that is, the basal meaning is inherent in the consonants, while the vowel-changes merely serve to signify grammatical modifications of the basal meaning. In the Indo-European languages vowels play a major role. Any vowel-change may lend the word an entirely different meaning. For example, the English words *bat*, *bait*, *bet*, *bate*, *but*, *boat*, *beat*, *boot*, *about* all have a common consonantal basis *bt*, but they have nothing in common either in etymology or in meaning. In Hebrew, on the other hand, the consonantal stem קדש carries the basal meaning *holy* in all its manifold

[29] Comp. op. cit., 2.
[30] Cf. below, note 81.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

changes in derivational and inflectional forms. Once the nature of a given consonantal stem is understood, it is possible to construct a long series of derivative forms, all having the same basic meaning. The various semantic shadings and modifications, as well as the differences in person, number, and gender, are indicated by mere changes of vowels, or by additions of prefixes and suffixes, as the case may be. Consequently, an understanding of the nature of paradigms opens up wide vistas of the language and provides an insight into its linguistic pattern. Equipped with this understanding it is possible to get along on a comparatively small basic vocabulary and to manipulate the language with relative ease and facility.

Saadia was the first to attempt the arrangement of paradigms. He employed the verb שמע as the model and confined himself to the Ḳal and Hif'il forms only.[31] But Moses Ḳimḥi, the older brother and teacher of David, is responsible for the final and standard arrangement, which has been adopted by the subsequent grammarians to this date with slight modifications.[32]

It was through the works of David Ḳimḥi that this paradigm arrangement was popularized. It was through the same channels that most of the grammatical ideas of the medieval grammarians found their way into modern grammatical works, including the quantitative theory of the vowels and the distinction between mobile and quiescent Shewa based on it.[33] Among the significant grammatical concepts and terms originated by the Ḳimḥis and gen-

[31] Cf. Skoss, *JQR.*, N. S., XXXIII, 2 and 3.
[32] Cf. below, notes 104 and 114.
[33] See § 3c[19].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

erally accepted by modern grammrians, are those of the Dagesh lene and of Waw consecutive.[34] David Ḳimḥi is also to be credited with a number of original and keen etymologies, such as those of נָיא and שָׁוְא which have puzzled so prominent a philologist as Ibn Janaḥ.[35]

It is impossible to enumerate here the manifold grammatical discussions by the medieval grammarians on the various aspects of the Hebrew language. There is hardly a phase of the language which escaped their scrutiny and comment. Theirs was a labor of love.[35a] With selfless devotion, untiring assiduity and unremitting zeal they applied themselves to the pioneering task of analyzing and investigating every aspect of the Hebrew language in the field of phonology, morphology and syntax.[36] They left a rich heritage, which, unfortunately, has not yet been fully exploited, although splendid efforts in this field of research have been made by such profound scholars as Bacher, Poznanski, Joseph and Hartwig Derenbourg, and Kokowzoff.

The reaction which set in against the works of Maimon-

[34] Cf. § 4f[32a] (Addenda) and § 21[100].

[35] Cf. § 47e'[416].

[35a] After having succeeded in unraveling some etymological difficulty, Ibn Janah waxes ecstatic and proclaims proudly: "This is one of the wonderful things we have discovered by the grace of God . . . after much labor, effort and study, and after searching day and night, so that we expend on oil (in burning the midnight oil) twice as much as other people spend on wine" (*Shorash.* s. v. בלל).

[36] The view is sometimes expressed by modern Hebrew grammarians to the effect that the medieval grammarians neglected the study of syntax, or that they had only a vague idea of it. This view is entirely incorrect. They did not treat of syntax as an independent category, but there is a considerable wealth of syntactical observations scattered through the works of these grammarians, as is demonstrated by the contents of Chapter VI of this volume. These observations attest their interest in these problems, as well as a keen insight and sound judgment in this branch of research.

Digitized by Google | Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ides toward the end of David Ḳimḥi's days, which he endeavored valiantly but vainly to offset, marked the wane of grammatical research and of any studies outside of the Talmud. Most of the Jewish scholars of the subsequent generations regarded the study of grammar as a waste of time, and some even considered such study heresy.[37] Even the study of Bible began to be regarded as of secondary importance and was gradually dwindling to such an extent that a German rabbi of the 17th century complained that there were certain rabbis in his generation "who had never in their lifetime seen a text of the Bible."[38] The center of interest in Hebrew grammar and lexicography shifted from Jewish to Christian scholars. The father of Hebrew grammar among the Christians was the famous humanist Johann Reuchlin (1522). His book, *De Rudimentis Hebraicis*, ushered in the Hebrew philological movement among the Christians. This movement was accelerated by the arrival of the itinerant Jewish scholar, Elias Levita. Through his personal contact with the Christian scholars and by means of his books, some of which were translated into Latin by his pupil, Sebastian Münster, Levita became the exponent of the Ḳimḥian School to the Christians and he set the Ḳimḥian stamp on succeeding grammatical works.

Although Ḳimḥi endeavored earnestly to systematize and simplify the available grammatical studies of his predecessors and thus to provide a "short cut" to the

[37] Comp. the complaints against this attitude by Efodi, *Ma'ase Efod*, 5; also by Judah L. Modena, *Beth Judah*, commentary on Kid., chapter 1, Mishna 1.

[38] Comp. S. Asaf, *Mekoroth le-Toldoth ha-Hinukh be-Yisrael*, I, 229.

Digitized by Google | Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

knowledge and proper use of the Hebrew language, he falls short of his aim. The *Mikhlol*, though the most comprehensive and systematic Hebrew Grammar of the middle ages, is far from accessible to the modern student of Hebrew grammar. The arrangement of the material is crude and antiquated. Digressions and excursions abound throughout the book. There is evidently little attempt at selection and gradation. Some of the most important points of grammar are cast into shadow by a multitude of subordinate details, or are interrupted by long irrelevant discussions. Similarly the grammatical terminology of the mediaeval grammarians is somewhat involved and unintelligible to the modern student of the Hebrew language and grammar.

It has been the purpose of this translation not merely to render as faithfully as possible the content of the *Mikhlol*, but particularly to recast the entire material and to reorganize it in the order and in the terms of modern grammatical works. Details bearing on particular points of grammar, scattered throughout the book, have been gleaned together and placed where they properly belong, according to our ideas and conceptions. The more important points of grammar have been made to stand out conspicuously, while those less important or incidental have been relegated to foot-notes and "remarks." These foot-notes are designated by the letters of the Alphabet. To accomplish all this it was necessary to glean together items belonging in the same category from various parts of the original text. The extent to which this was done can be seen in the Table of Contents, where the numbers of the pages in the *Mikhlol*,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Lyk edition, from which the items were gleaned, are given in parentheses.

The material of the *Mikhlol* has, I believe, been exhausted in the translation. Nothing of any grammatical importance whatsoever has been omitted, though the volume of the book is considerably condensed, thanks to the rejection of needless repetitions and tautologies, as well as to the rearrangement and reorganization.

In the notes appended by the translator, indicated by Arabic numerals, an attempt is made to trace as far back as possible the sources from which Ḳimḥi probably drew his material, directly or indirectly, and thereby to shed light on the gradual development of grammatical thinking prior to Ḳimḥi. Ḳimḥi was apparently unable to read Arabic[39] and had, therefore, no direct access to the grammatical works of his brilliant predecessors written in that language, which had not been translated. Yet he was thoroughly familiar with their ideas and opinions, partly through the Hebrew works of Ibn Chiquitilla, Ibn Ezra, his father, etc., and partly because the study of Hebrew grammar may still have been considerably wide-spread in his days, despite the negative attitude of the Talmudists.[40] Grammatical ideas may still have been floating in the air, as it were, in consequence of the keen philological controversies between Ibn Janaḥ and Samuel ha-Nagid.[41] Nor did the traces of the severe attack by Dunash against Menaḥem and Saadia and the counter-attacks of their disciples entirely dis-

[39] Cf. Geiger, *Oṣar Neḥmad* II, 158.

[40] Cf. below, note 2.

[41] Cf. Derenbourg in his introduction to *Opuscules d'Abou'l-Walid* XXXII ff. and Bacher, Introduction to Ibn Janaḥ's *Sefer ha-Shorashim* XVI ff.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

appear; cf. the fresh criticisms of Ibn Ezra in *Sefath Yether*, R. Tam's *Hakhra'oth*, and Joseph Ḳimḥi in *Sefer ha-Galui.* An effort is also made in these notes to trace the influence of Ḳimḥi on subsequent grammarians and to examine the achievements of the mediaeval Hebrew grammarians in the light of modern grammatical researches, thus affording the student of Hebrew a historical digest of the entire range of Hebrew grammatical study and investigation.

For the convenience of the student these notes are attached to the chapters to which they respectively belong. In longer chapters, which are subdivided into sections marked by Roman capital letters, the notes follow each section.

There are also to be found in the translated text occasional interpolations introduced by the translator for the purpose of elucidation and completion. These interpolations are included in brackets. Brief notes and references, as well as readings varying from our masoretic text as represented by Mikra'oth Gedoloth, are also occasionally interpolated and included in brackets. It is however, to be borne in mind with references to the variant readings that Ḳimḥi quoted largely from memory,[42] and some of the slight deviations in reading may be due to misquotations from his text of the Bible.

This Grammar of Ḳimḥi, now made accessible, as well as the notes appended thereto, will, I hope, initiate the student of Hebrew into the vast riches of grammatical knowledge stored away in the obscure books of the early grammarians, much of which remained hitherto unexploited. Koenig does refer frequently to Ḳimḥi, but he

[42] Cf. note 450a.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

did not avail himself to any considerable degree of the works of Ḳimḥi's predecessors. Had these sources been utilized, much of the intellectual energy of the modern scholars invested in relearning grammatical ideas and principles, discovered long ago, could have been spared and directed to fresh discoveries and to the promotion of the growth of this science.

I can hardly express adequately my heavy indebtedness, in the preparation of this work, to my late teacher, that splendid grammarian and biblical scholar, Professor Max L. Margolis. His indefatigability in the pursuit of knowledge, his scientific method of research, and his scrupulous accuracy, have been to me an invaluable source of stimulation and direction. I am also indebted to Professor Alexander Marx of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America for having suggested the subject of this dissertation, as well as for having furnished me with a helpful bibliography. My heartiest thanks are extended to Dr. Julius H. Greenstone and to Professor Solomon L. Skoss of Dropsie College for their careful and critical reading of the manuscript and some of the proof, and for their scholarly comments, as well as to Dr. Menahem G. Glenn for calling my attention to some inaccuracies in my manuscript of biblical quotations. I also make acknowledgement of the valuable guidance given, and lively interest in this work evinced, by the late Doctor Cyrus Adler, whose assistance made possible the publication of the first part of this work in 1933. Submitted as a thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Dropsie College, this part was published with the aid of the Rose Adler Fund.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Lack of funds made it impossible to publish the entire manuscript in 1933. Since the portion then published is now out of print, it seems desirable to incorporate it into this volume, so that the interested reader may have the book in its entirety. Nor could the financial difficulties have been overcome even now had it not been for the generosity of a number of friends and scholarly institutions.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge with gratitude the assistance given me by my friends and colleagues Dr. Azriel Eisenberg, Dr. Leon J. Liebreich and Dr. Maurice Jacobs. I am especially grateful to Dr. Solomon Grayzel, President of the Board of Overseers of Gratz College. The Publication of this book at this time was made possible largely through his untiring efforts on behalf of this project.

August 1, 1952 WILLIAM CHOMSKY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

When the first part of this work was published, some twenty years ago, many of us hoped that the publication of the entire highly significant study would not be long delayed. But year followed year and Dr. Chomsky still could not see his way clear to making the results of his labor available to the interested scholars. A number of his friends thereupon organized themselves into a committee and prevailed upon him to put the finishing touches to his work and entrust the manuscript to them. I gladly accepted the chairmanship of this committee.

It is a pleasure and an honor to extend the committee's thanks to the persons and institutions who came to our aid. Chief among these have been the following: The Lucius N. Littauer Foundation and its director, Mr. Harry

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Starr; The American Academy for Jewish Research; Har Zion Temple of Philadelphia and Rabbi David Goldstein. Also, the following Congregations and their Rabbis: Anshei Emet Congregation of Chicago, Illinois, and Rabbi Solomon Goldman; Temple Beth El of Cedarhurst, Long Island, and Rabbi Edward T. Sandrow; Congregation B'nai Jeshurun of New York and Rabbi Israel Goldstein; Chizuk Amuno Congregation of Baltimore; Congregation Emanu-El of New York City and Rabbi Julius Mark; Temple Emanuel of Worcester, Mass., and Rabbi Joseph Klein; Temple Israel Religious School of Boston; Congregation Keneseth Israel of Philadelphia and Rabbi Bertram W. Korn; Drs. Victor Reichert and Stanley Brav of the Rockdale Avenue Temple in Cincinnati, Ohio; Rodef Shalom Temple of Pittsburgh and Rabbi Solomon Freehof; Congregation Rodeph Shalom of Philadelphia and Rabbi David H. Wice; The Germantown Jewish Center of Philadelphia and Rabbi Elias Charry. And, the following individuals: Drs. Mortimer J. Cohen; A. A. Neuman; William Fineshriber; Messrs. Hyman Bomze; Sol Einhorn; A. M. Ellis; Meyer Feinstein; Gerald Feldstern; Bernard L. Frankel; Edward Jacobs; Herbert Jacobs; Sol Levenson; Howard S. Levy; Sydney J. Markowitz; L. B. Meyerhoff; Albert Nalibotsky; Leon J. Obermayer; L. B. Orlowitz; Edward N. Polisher; I. Erwin Satinsky; Sol Satinsky; David Weber; Mr. and Mrs. A. Berman; Mr. and Mrs. Herman Feldman; Mrs. Gabrielle Auspitz; Mrs. J. A. Meltzer.

We hope that all of these friends will share our satisfaction in seeing this eminent work of scholarship in its published form.

August 1, 1952 SOLOMON GRAYZEL

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

DAVID ḲIMḤI'S

HEBREW GRAMMAR

(MIKHLOL)

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Anf. = Anfänge der Hebräischen Grammatik by Wilhelm Bacher, in ZDMG. XLIX (1895) 1–62, 335–92, also separately

AJSL. = American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures

Bauer-Leander = Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache, Hans Bauer and Pontus Leander, Halle, 1918

Ben Yehuda = Thesaurus Totius Hebraitatis

Beitr. = Beiträge zur Semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, Theodore Nöldeke, Strassburg, 1904

Comp. Gr. = Comparative Grammar

Diḳ. = Diḳduḳe ha-Teamim, Aharon ben Moshe ben Asher, ed. S. Baer and H. L. Strack, Leipzig, 1879

Ew. = Ewald, Heinrich, Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache, Leipzig, 1855

Galui = Sefer ha-Galui, ed. Mathews, Berlin, 1877

Ges.-Bergstrasser = Hebräische Grammatik von Gesenius-Bergstrasser, Leipzig, 1918–26

Ges.-Buhl = Handwörterbuch, Wilhelm Gesenius — Frants Buhl, Leipzig, 1921

Ges.-K. = Hebrew Grammar, Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley, Oxford, 1910

GvG. = Grundriss der vergleichenden Sprachen, Berlin, 1908–13

Ḥayyuj = Shelosha Sifre Diḳduḳ by Judah Ḥayyuj, ed. John W. Nutt, London and Berlin, 1870

Ibn Ezra etc. = Abraham Ibn Ezra als Grammatiker, Wilhelm Bacher, Strassburg, 1882

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Joüon = Grammaire de L'Hébreu Biblique, P. Paul Joüon, Rome, 1923

JQR. = Jewish Quarterly Review
N. S. = New Series
O. S. = Old Series

JAOS. = Journal of American Oriental Society

JBL. = Journal of Biblical Literature

Koenig = Lehrgebäude der Hebräischen Sprache, F. E. Koenig, Leipzig, 1881–95, Syntax, Leipzig, 1897

Lambert = Traité de Grammaire Hebraique

LgB. = Lehrgebäude der Hebräischen Sprache

Liḳ. = Liḳḳuṭe Ḳadmonioth, S. Pinsker, Vienna, 1860

Ma'ase Efod = Sefer Ma'ase Efod, Profiat Duran, ed. Friedländer-Kohn, Vienna, 1865

Maḥ. = Maḥbereth Menaḥem ben Saruḳ, ed. Filipowski, London, 1854

Moz. = Moznayim by Abraham Ibn Ezra, ed. W. Heidenheim, Offenbach, 1791

Mikh. = Mikhlol, ed. Rittenberg, Lyck, 1862

Min. Shai = Minhath Shai, Yedidiah Solomon ben Abraham Norzi (in Miḳraoth Gedoloth)

Nb. = Nominalbildung in den Semitischen Sprachen, Leipzig, 1889–94

Notice = Notice sur la Lexicographie Hebräique avec de Remarques de quelques Grammariens Posterieurs a Ibn Djanah, A. Neubauer

Noviye Mater. = Noviye Materiali, Petrograd, 1916

Olsh. = Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache, Justus Olshausen, 1861

Opusc. = Opuscules et Traités d'Abou'l-Walid Merwan Ibn Djinah, publiés par T. and H. Derenbourg, Paris 1880

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Parḥon = Maḥbereth he-'Arukh, Pressburg, 1844

REJ. = Revue des Études Juives

Riḳ. = Sefer ha-Riḳmah by Jonah Ibn Janaḥ, ed. Goldberg, 1856

Ris. = Risālah of Judah Ibn Ḳoreish, ed. Bargès and Goldberg, Paris 1857

Saadia = Zikhron la-Rishonim V, ha-Sarid we-ha-Palit mi-Sefer ha-Egron we-Sefer ha-Galui, ed. Harkavi, Petersburg, 1891

SB. = Safah Berurah, Abraham Ibn Ezra, ed. Lippman, Fürth, 1839

Sem. Sprachw. = Semitische Sprachwissenschaft, Leipzig, 1906

Shor. = Sefer ha-Shorashim, Abulwalid Merwān (R. Jonah) Ibn Janaḥ, ed. Wilhelm Bacher, Berlin, 1896; Sefer ha-Shorashim, David Ḳimḥi, Venice, 1546; Oṣar ha-Shorashim, J. L. Ben Zeeb, ed. Letteris, 1862–64

Stade = Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Grammatik, Leipzig, 1879

Tesh. = Teshuboth

Syr. Gr. = Syrische Grammatik

Ṣ. = Sefer Ṣaḥoth, Abraham Ibn Ezra, ed. Lippman, Fürth, 1827

Tesh. = Teshuboth Talmide Menaḥem-Dunash, ed. S. G. Stern, Vienna, 1870

Tesh. ag. Saadiah = Kritik des Dunash ben Labrat, ed. Schröter, Breslau, 1866

Tesh. ag. Men. = Criticae vocum recensiones Dunash b. Labrat etc., ed. Filipowski, London, 1855

ThlZ. = Theologische Literaturzeitung

ZA. = Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete

ZAW. = Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

Zik. = Sefer Zikkaron, ed. Wilhelm Bacher, Berlin, 1888

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Joüon = Grammaire de L'Hébreu Biblique, P. Paul Joüon, Rome, 1923

JQR. = Jewish Quarterly Review
N. S. = New Series
O. S. = Old Series

JAOS. = Journal of American Oriental Society

JBL. = Journal of Biblical Literature

Koenig = Lehrgebäude der Hebräischen Sprache, F. E. Koenig, Leipzig, 1881–95, Syntax, Leipzig, 1897

Lambert = Traité de Grammaire Hebraique

LgB. = Lehrgebäude der Hebräischen Sprache

Liḳ. = Liḳḳuṭe Ḳadmonioth, S. Pinsker, Vienna, 1860

Ma'ase Efod = Sefer Ma'ase Efod, Profiat Duran, ed. Friedländer-Kohn, Vienna, 1865

Maḥ. = Maḥbereth Menaḥem ben Saruḳ, ed. Filipowski, London, 1854

Moz. = Moznayim by Abraham Ibn Ezra, ed. W. Heidenheim, Offenbach, 1791

Mikh. = Mikhlol, ed. Rittenberg, Lyck, 1862

Min. Shai = Minhath Shai, Yedidiah Solomon ben Abraham Norzi (in Miḳraoth Gedoloth)

Nb. = Nominalbildung in den Semitischen Sprachen, Leipzig, 1889–94

Notice = Notice sur la Lexicographie Hebräique avec de Remarques de quelques Grammariens Posterieurs a Ibn Djanah, A. Neubauer

Noviye Mater. = Noviye Materiali, Petrograd, 1916

Olsh. = Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache, Justus Olshausen, 1861

Opusc. = Opuscules et Traités d'Abou'l-Walid Merwan Ibn Djinah, publiés par T. and H. Derenbourg, Paris 1880

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Parḥon = Maḥbereth he-'Arukh, Pressburg, 1844
REJ. = Revue des Études Juives
Riḳ. = Sefer ha-Riḳmah by Jonah Ibn Janaḥ, ed. Goldberg, 1856
Ris. = Risālah of Judah Ibn Ḳoreish, ed. Bargès and Goldberg, Paris 1857
Saadia = Zikhron la-Rishonim V, ha-Sarid we-ha-Palit mi-Sefer ha-Egron we-Sefer ha-Galui, ed. Harkavi, Petersburg, 1891
SB. = Safah Berurah, Abraham Ibn Ezra, ed. Lippman, Fürth, 1839
Sem. Sprachw. = Semitische Sprachwissenschaft, Leipzig, 1906
Shor. = Sefer ha-Shorashim, Abulwalid Merwān (R. Jonah) Ibn Janaḥ, ed. Wilhelm Bacher, Berlin, 1896; Sefer ha-Shorashim, David Ḳimḥi, Venice, 1546; Oṣar ha-Shorashim, J. L. Ben Zeeb, ed. Letteris, 1862–64
Stade = Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Grammatik, Leipzig, 1879
Tesh. = Teshuboth
Syr. Gr. = Syrische Grammatik
Ṣ. = Sefer Ṣaḥoth', Abraham Ibn Ezra, ed. Lippman, Fürth, 1827
Tesh. = Teshuboth Talmide Menaḥem-Dunash, ed. S. G. Stern, Vienna, 1870
Tesh. ag. Saadiah = Kritik des Dunash ben Labrat, ed. Schröter, Breslau, 1866
Tesh. ag. Men. = Criticae vocum recensiones Dunash b. Labrat etc., ed. Filipowski, London, 1855
ThlZ. = Theologische Literaturzeitung
ZA. = Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete
ZAW. = Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
Zik. = Sefer Zikkaron, ed. Wilhelm Bacher, Berlin, 1888

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NAMES AND SOURCES QUOTED BY ḲIMḤI

Abraham Ibn Ezra §§ 69h; 77b; 86a; 90c

Ben Asher §§ 5a; 6d; 7k; 16h; 31h; 33a; 36i; 40g'; 47j; 56c

Ben Naftali §§ 7c, i, k; 16h, 33a; 36i; 40g'; 51a; 56c

Benveniste, Isaac § 52e

Bereshith Rabba § 89d

Eli ben Yehuda ha-Nazir § 70. See also note 22

Ḥayyuj, Judah, pp. 8, 9; §§ 21d; 23f; 32d; 34n; 35c, 36i, l; 37h, v; 38f, k, m, n; 40e', f', g', h'; 47o

Ḥibbur ha-Leḳet (Joseph Ḳimḥi) § 40h' (e)

Hilleli Ms. §§ 6c, 40p, also note 128

Ibn Chiquitilla, Isaac § 36l

Ibn Chiquitilla, Moshe ha-Kohen §§ 24i; 32d, 33j

Ibn Ghiyāth, Isaac § 47m

Ibn Gabirol § 50k and note 438

Ibn Ezra, Abraham, §§ 24i, 33j, 69h, 77b, 86a, 90c

Ibn Ezra, Moses § 81f, note 643

Ibn Janaḥ, Jonah pp. 8, 9; §§ 3h; 6e; 16b; 23b; 24e, 35d, h; 36e, i, q; 37h, l, v; 38b, c, d, m, n; 40j, g'; 58c; 69h; 72f; 77b; 85k.

Jacob ben El'azar §§ 6c; 16b; 22j; 23h; 39k; 40l, p; 52d; on his identity see note 83

Jerusalem Ms. §§ 19d; 58c; 72f.

Ḳimḥi, Joseph §§ 23b; 27c; 33g; 35c; 36f; 37v; 38c; 38c, d, v; 40g', h'; 51i, 81f; 86a

Ḳimḥi, Moses §§ 25e, h; 34n; 36b; 38w; 40h'

Masora §§ 5e, 7m, 13a, 16h, 24a, 63d, 73a, 75c

Maḥzora Rabba § 5c

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Midrash Rabba § 89d
Mss. of the Bible §§ 4b, e; 5c; 16c, g; 21h; 22b; 24a; 34n; 40p, 54e, 58c, 72g
Saadia § 6e
Samuel ha-Nagid §§ 21h, 24k
Sefer ha-Shalem, see Jacob ben El'azar
Sefer Yeṣira § 7a, o
Taḥbosheth (Moses Ḳimḥi) § 25e, h
Talmud, p. 8, §§ 1d; 6e, f; 10c; 14; 27c; 34b, g, 36m, o; 44a, b, c; 50k; 52b, d; 53j, l; 59e; 62g; 66i, u'; 81d; 82e; 85j, o
Targum Jonathan § 47b
Tosefta § 34g
Yehuda ha-Nazir, see Eli ben Yehuda ha-Nazir

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

PRAISED and exalted be He who placed the spirit of man within him and gave him knowledge and understanding to investigate the intelligent soul, to trace its paths and trends, to walk in the ways of uprightness and integrity, "to behold the graciousness of the Lord and to visit early in His temple." He selected Israel from amongst all the nations, and the Hebrew language from amongst all the languages.[1] In it He revealed Himself to His people on the Mount and spoke to them "ten words." He commanded, through His prophets, to teach them His commandments, statutes and righteous ordinances, so that even in their youth they were instructed in the tongue of their forefathers.

But ever since our ancestors were exiled into foreign countries they forgot the sacred tongue and trained their children and grandchildren to speak the language of the respective nations among whom they dwelt. We have now

[1] Cf. Menaḥem in *Maḥbereth* (ed. Filipowski), Introduction, p. 1. That Hebrew is the oldest and "chosen" language was repeatedly maintained by mediaeval Hebrew grammarians and poets. See Ibn Gabirol in *'Anaḳ* (ed. Bialik-Ravnitski) v. 47f., Judah Halevi in *Kusari* (ed. Cassel), pp. 167–169 and 341, and Ibn Ezra (quoted by Bacher in *Ibn Ezra als Grammatiker*, pp. 33, n. 2 and 34, n. 12). This is probably to be traced to the statements in Bereshith Rabba (18:6 and 31:8) to the effect that the Hebrew language was created simultaneously with the world. It may be interesting to note that this notion with regard to the priority of the Hebrew language was also prevalent among non-Jewish students of language, who resorted to all sorts of whimsical etymologies to prove that the origin of the European languages is to be found in Hebrew (cf. Jespersen, *Language*, 1921, p. 21).

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

left only that which is transmitted in writing, namely the twenty-four books [of the Bible] and the Mishna [including also the Gemara]. We should therefore take good care of what is left to us of our tongue so that we employ it in accordance with its laws and do not corrupt or misuse it.

Our learned predecessors have indeed paved the way and have taught us the principles of our language. Juda Ḥayyuj of Fez, finding the people slovenly and indiscriminate in their use of Hebrew, composed two enlightening treatises on verbs containing weak and double letters. Jona Ibn Janaḥ, subsequently, wrote more copiously on Hebrew grammar, to our knowledge, than any of his predecessors. Others added grammatical treatises of their own, and the student of grammar will find himself at sea in the midst of so much grammatical literature, which requires a lifetime for its consumption.

Now, although one should not be ignorant of the science of grammar, he ought to devote his time chiefly to the study of the Torah, the Talmud, the commentaries, and to the practice of the laws. The knowledge of grammar necessary for understanding the structure of the language and for employing it correctly in speech and in writing should therefore be acquired through a short cut, as our rabbis remarked: "A man should always teach his pupils a short road."[2] The need for the knowledge of Hebrew grammar

[2] In the Hebrew text the quotation reads: לעולם ילמד אדם לתלמידו דרך קצרה. Ḳimḥi probably has reference to the passage in Ḥullin 63b לעולם ישנה אדם לתלמידו דרך קצרה, but he apparently quotes from memory (see below, note 9) and misquotes this passage. Compare this mild apologetic tone of Ḳimḥi on behalf of Hebrew grammar with the severe criticisms leveled by Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. ed. Goldberg,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

can be plentifully met by the treatises of Ḥayyuj and the supplements of Ibn Janaḥ [here the *Mustalḥaḳ and Risalat at-Taḳrib wat-Tashil* are probably referred to], while lexical information is to be found in *Sefer ha-Shorashim* [by Ibn Janaḥ]. There are, however, in these books some superfluities which the teacher may discard, as well as some omissions which should be supplied.

The Lord has stirred my spirit and strengthened my heart to write a book concisely. I come thus like the gleaner after the reaper, following in the footsteps of my predecessors, but abridging their material. I called this book *Mikhlol*, for I intend to include therein succinctly both the grammar and the lexicography of the Hebrew language and to make it easily and readily available for the student. The first part will constitute the grammar, the second the lexicon.

The Hebrew language, like all other languages, is divided

Intr. V) and by the anonymous author of the *Kontres*, published by Poznański (Berlin, 1894, p. 19), against the disparaging attitude of the Talmudists, in their respective generations, towards grammatical investigations. This attitude seems to have been characteristic of the Talmudists ever since down to recent days. See the complaints of Joseph Ḳimḥi (Introduction to *Sefer ha-Galui*, ed. Mathews, p. 3) as well as those of Efodi and Goldberg (*Toldoth Rabbi Jonah*, attached to *Riḳma*, p. 4, note 1). Cf. also the invectives of Judah b. Isaac Modena (1571–1649) quoted in addenda to *Riḳma*, p. 251. In the days of David Ḳimḥi the opposition to all studies outside of the Talmud became even more acrimonious among the Talmudists of the Provence and France as a result of the controversy over the works of the Rambam (*Madda'* and *Moreh*). On Ḳimḥi's part in this controversy see *Oṣar Neḥmad* II, p. 170f. and Graetz, *Gesch.* vol. VII, note 1, pp. 433–9.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

into three parts: noun, verb and particle.[3] Although the noun precedes the verb and is regarded in its relation to it as the substance to its accident,[4] yet I begin with the verb because of its significance and frequent usage. The noun and particle will then follow respectively.[5] In the lexicon, however, the alphabetical arrangement, adopted by my predecessors, will be followed.

[3] This threefold division of the Hebrew language is first found in Dunash's *Teshuboth against Menaḥem* (ed. Filipowski) p. 5b: וכל המבטא מחולק על שלשה חלקים שמות ופועלים ותיבות הענינים. It was probably taken over by Dunash from Arabic grammar and may have been found already in Saadia's works (see Bacher's *Anf.* 105). The term תֵּיבוֹת הענינים employed by Dunash to denote the particles (probably after the Arabic *ḥuruf al-ma'āni*) is found also in the anonymous Hebrew grammar published by Poznański, p. 1 (see also note ad 1.). Joseph Ḳimḥi uses the term מִלַּת הַדֶּבֶק (*Zik.*, ed. Bacher, pp. 14 and 19). The terms generally employed by Ibn Ezra for the particles are אות עִנְיָן and מִלַּת עִנְיָן (cf. *Moz.* 24a, 30a, 40a, etc.). On other terms for particles used by Hebrew grammarians see Fuchs in *Haḥoḳer* (Hebrew monthly) II, 120 and note 3. The term מִלִּים employed by David Ḳimḥi is criticized and rejected by Efodi (*Ma'ase Efod*, ed. Friedländer-Kahn, p. 31) in favor of מִלּוֹת הַטַּעַם, which was coined by Ibn Tibbon in his translation of Ibn Janaḥ's *Kitāb al-Luma'* (*Riḳ.* 3). The term מִלִּים was, however, generally accepted by the succeeding Hebrew grammarians.

[4] This philosophical background of the parts of speech was laid down by Ibn Gabirol in his grammatical poem *'Anaḳ* v. 117f. and was adopted by Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* chapter 1) and Ibn Ezra (see Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc., 71f.). A more elaborate discussion of this theory from the philological standpoint is found below § 43b and note 360.

[5] In accordance with our plan, as explained in the translator's preface, this arrangement has been abandoned and replaced by that usually pursued by modern grammarians.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

CHAPTER ONE. PHONOLOGY

§ 1. The Consonants

a. The consonants are divided, according to the organs of speech, into the following categories:[6]

(a) Laryngeals אחה"ע

(b) Palatals גיכ"ק

(c) Dentals זסשר"ץ

(d) Lingual-dentals, pronounced with the tip of the tongue drawn back towards the teeth דטלנ"ת.

(e) Labials בומ"ף

b. *Rem.* The pronunciation of מ and נ is aided also by the nostrils [Joseph Ḳimḥi, Zik. p. 2].

c. Homo-organic consonants sometimes interchange for euphonic reasons. Thus, in Hithpa'el, the ת of the preformative changes to ט in נִצְטַדָּק Gn 44:16 and to ד in הִזְדְּמִנְתּוּן Dn 2:9.[7]

d. The following letters are kindred in sound and should be carefully differentiated in pronunciation:

(a) א and ע[8]

(b) ב (Rāfe) and Waw

(c) ה and ח[a 8]

(d) ז, צ, ס, ש and ת (Rāfe)[b]

(e) ט and ת

(f) כ and ק

a. Cf. in this connection Meg. 24b relative to the pronunciation of the ח in וְחִכֵּיתִי Is 8:17.[9]

b. Cf. Y. Ber 4, where the Rabbis insist on the distinct and articulate pronunciation of the ז in תִּזְכְּרוּ Nu 15:40, of the ס in חַסְדּוֹ Ps 117:2 and

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

§ 2. Transposition (Metathesis) of Consonants[10]

There are numerous instances of transposition of consonants in the Bible, e.g. כֶּשֶׂב and כֶּבֶשׂ, שַׂלְמָה and שִׂמְלָה, לַעֲגֵי Is 28:11 and עִלְּגִים ibid 32:4, תמנת חֶרֶס Ju 2:9 and תמנת סֶרַח Jos 19:50, גֹּמֶא Is 18:2 and הָאֲגַמִּים Jr 51:32, תִּמְחַץ Ps 68:24 and חֲמוּץ Is 63:1, וַיַּחֲלֹשׁ Ex 17:13 and הַנֶּחֱשָׁלִים Dt 25:18, מְתַלְּעוֹת Joel 1:6 and מַלְתְּעוֹת Ps 58:7, לַהֲקַת 1S 19:20 and קְהִלַּת Dt 33:4, סָחִישׁ 2K 19:29 and שָׁחִיס Is 37:30, סְפִיחֶיהָ Jb 14:19 and סוֹחֵף Pr 28:3, אַיֵּה Gn 18:9 and אֱהִי Hos 13:10, וַיִּפְצַר Gn 19:3 and וַיִּפְרָץ 2K 5:23, נִגְרַזְתִּי Ps 31:23 and נִגְזָרְתִּי La 3:54, חָרוּת Ex 32:16 and חֲתָר Ez 12:5, etc.

§ 3. Vowel Signs and their Changes

a. There are ten vowels in Hebrew, five long (mothers) and five short (daughters) vowels, without the aid of which no letter can be sounded.[11]

A. Long Vowels:[12]

(a) Ḳameṣ[13] (ָ) [ā][14]

(b) Ṣere (ֵי and ֵ) [ē], also called Ḳameṣ ḳaṭan because of its similarity to the Ḳameṣ in that *it* also is followed by a latent quiescent.[15] The Ḳameṣ and Ṣere are frequently interchanged [cf. e.g. below §§ 33g and 36n].

(c) Ḥolem (וֹ and ֹ) [ō and o]

(d) Shureḳ (וּ) [ū][16]

(e) Ḥireḳ (ִי and ִ) [ī]

B. Short[17] Vowels:

(a) Pathaḥ gadol (ַ), pronounced like short Ḳameṣ [ă].

of the ע in וְשָׁבַע Dt 11:21; in order to distinguish them, respectively, from חָקְרוּ, חֲדוּ and וְשָׁבָה.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

(b) Segol (ֶ), pronounced like short Ṣere [ĕ]. It is also called Pathaḥ ḳaṭan, because of its phonetic kinship with the Pathaḥ, and they are occasionally interchanged [cf. below § 9h].

(c) Ḳameṣ haṭuf, i. e. hurried Ḳameṣ (ָ), pronounced like a short Ḥolem [ŏ].

Rem. When not followed by a Dagesh or Shewa quiescent, the Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf is sometimes compounded with Shewa to indicate its short or hurried sound,[18] e. g. אֳנִי 1K 10:11, חֳלִי Pr 25:12 [חֲלִי in our text]. צֳרִי Gn 43:11, etc. (But in גָּזִי Jr 7:29, קָרְבָּן, etc., the hurried sound of this Ḳameṣ is sufficiently evidenced by the following Dagesh or silent Shewa.

(d) Ḥireḳ without Yod, pronounced like a short Ḥireḳ [ĭ].

(e) Ḳibbuṣ (ֻ), pronounced like a short Shureḳ [ŭ].

b. The five long vowels are always open (entailing one of the latent quiescents אהוי) and are not followed by Dagesh, except when they have the tone, in which case they remain open and are pronounced long, e. g. חָדֵ֫לּוּ Ju 5:7 נָזֹ֫לּוּ Is 64:2 שֹׁ֫מּוּ Jr 2:12.

c. When a long vowel is followed by a Shewa, the vowel retains its long sound and the Shewa is vocal, e. g. שָׁמְרוּ, זָכְרוּ, יֵרְדוּ, אוֹמְרִים, סִיסְרָא, שׁוּבְךָ.[19]

d. The sound of the short vowels is hurried, and the Shewa following them is silent, e. g. יִשְׁמֹר, צִמְרִי, נַפְנִי, שֻׁלְחָן, קָרְבָּן, אֻגְרֹף.

e. The short vowels are lengthened in the following cases:[20]

A. Pathaḥ.

(a) When a pathaḥ is followed by a laryngeal letter

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

with a Shewa, a Pathaḥ is joined to this Shewa to lengthen the sound of the preceding vowel and to add stress to the laryngeal letter, e. g. וְשַׁחֲטוּ Ex 12:21, יַעֲלֶה; but there are numerous exceptions, e. g. תַּחְמֹל Dt 13:9, תַחְמֹד Ex 20:17, etc.

(b) When the tone is on the penultima, the tone-bearing Pathaḥ is lengthened even though the Shewa following it is silent, e. g. שַׁבְתִּי, וְזָכַרְתִּי Ec 9:11 קַמְנוּ Ps 20:9. Similarly the Pathaḥ preceding a laryngeal with a simple Shewa is lengthened, whilst the Shewa following it is silent, e. g. שִׂמַּחְתִּי, שָׁמַעְנוּ, אֲנַחְנוּ.

f. B. Ḥireḳ.

(a) Before a laryngeal with a Shewa, the Ḥireḳ is lengthened, and the Shewa is compounded with Pathaḥ, e. g. שִׁחֲדוּ Jb 6:22.

(b) When the Ḥireḳ has a Metheg its sound is lengthened even before a non-laryngeal, while the Shewa following it, though simple, is pronounced as if Pathaḥ were added to it e. g. סִבְכֵי, Is 10:34, בְּשִׁקְתוֹת Gn 30:38, בִּקְסָם שָׁוְא Ez 21:28 [in our text כִּקְסוֹם, without Metheg].

g. C. Segol.

(a) The Segol is lengthened in sound when preceding a laryngeal with a Shewa. A Segol is then added to the Shewa, e. g. אֶעֱמוֹד, אֶעֱלֶה.

(b) The Segol is likewise lengthened when it bears the tone, e. g. גֶּפֶן, שֶׁמֶרֶת, etc.[21]

(c) At the end of the word, when the Segol is followed by a vowel letter, e. g. אֶגְלֶה.

h. D. Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf.

(a) This Ḳameṣ is pronounced long[22] in הַקָּרְבָּן Ez

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

40:43,[a] הַדָּרְבָן 1S 13:21, כַּדָּרְבֹנוֹת Ec 12:11, וְיָשְׁפֶה Ex 28:20 [in our text וְיָשְׁפֵה], וּבָרְקַת Ez 28:13, וְשָׂהֲדִי Jb 16:19. מִדָּלְיָו Nu 24:7. The sound of the Ķameş in קָרְחוּ Jr 46:23 is disputed; some regard it as Ķameş ḥatuf and construe the word as an Imperative, whilst others read the Ķameş long, taking the form to be a Perfect. The latter view seems correct.[23]

A Ķameş followed by two Shewas is always pronounced hurriedly, e. g. יָקְתְאֵל 2K 14:7, יָקְדְעָם Jos 15:56, יָקְמְעָם 1 Chr 6:53, יָשְׁבְּקָשָׁה ibid 25:4, etc.

i. E. Ķibbuş.

(a) The Ķibbuş is pronounced long when a Pathaḥ is added to the Shewa following it, e. g. רֻטֲפַשׁ Jb 33:25.

j. *Rem.* When a long vowel precedes any of these lengthened short vowels which bear the tone, its sound is shortened; e. g. זָכַרְתִּי Jr 2:2, but in case of וְשָׁמַרְתָּ Ex 15:26, etc., the short vowels are toneless, hence the long vowels preceding them remain long. In מֵרֵאשִׁית Dt 11:12, מֵראשׁוֹ Lv 13:12, the vowels of the מs are pronounced long, because of their remoteness from the tone. For the same reasons the vowels remain long [and take metheg] in בְּכוֹבָעִים Jr 46:4, תּוֹעֵבָה Gn 43:32, חִידָתִי Ju 14:18, שׁוּעָלִים ibid 15:4, לְקָסְתִּי Cn 1:9, וְעֻגָבִי Jb 30:31,[24] but are shortened in אוֹמֵר, שׁוֹמֵר, בּוֹעֵרָה Hos 7:4, שִׁירָה, חִידָה, חִידָתְךָ Ju 14:13, שׁוּעָל and עוּגָב.

k. The short vowels are lengthened when they precede a toneless laryngeal, e. g. הַחִלּוֹתִי Dt 2:31, הַחִתּוֹתָ Is 9:3 הָאָמוּר Mi 2:7, etc.

a. Ibn Janaḥ, however, reads this Ķameş hurried and the ב spirant [*Shor*. ed. Bacher, 456].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

§ 4. Shewa,[25] Its Character, Function and Use

a. The Shewa is an auxiliary, not an independent vowel, as illustrated in the following three cases:[26]

b. 1. When the Shewa is followed by any of the laryngeals אחהע its sound is assimilated to the vowel of the laryngeal, e. g. יְאַבֶּד־ Pr 29:3; קְחוּ; שְׁאַר, בְּאֵר, תְּאֵנָה, קְחִי Is 47:2 סְחִי La 3:45; וּמִגְּעָר, שְׁאוֹל, לְעוֹלָם Is 54:9 (in some authentic Mss. the Gimel has a Ḥatef Ḳameṣ).[27] A Sheva accompanied by Ga'ya[27a] [grave Metheg] is allowed the full sound of the vowel following it, for the Ga'ya lengthens its sound, e. g. כְּהַרְרֵי Ps 36:7, לְעוֹלָם ibid 49:12, שְׂאוּ ibid 81:3, etc.

c. 2. The sound of the Shewa preceding a Yod is always assimilated to Ḥireḳ,[28] even when the Yod has any other vowel besides Ḥireḳ e. g. יְיַחֵל Mi 5:6;[29] when accompanied by a Ga'ya this Shewa is pronounced like long Ḥireḳ, e. g. בְּיַד Ps 77:21, וְיֵדְעוּ ibid 59:14.[29a] But when compounded with Pathaḥ or Segol, the Shewa is assimilated in sound to the vowel with which it is compounded, e. g. חֲיִי, הֱיוּ, הֱיֵה.

d. 3. The Shewa preceding any other letter, besides Yod or אחהע, approximates the Pathaḥ in sound, whatever the vowel following it may be, e. g. בְּרָכָה, גְּלִילִים, etc. When joined by Ga'ya, the Shewa has the full sound of the Pathaḥ, e. g. בְּמַקְהֵלוֹת Ps 68:27, etc.[30]

e. When two Shewas follow each other, whether in the middle or in the end of the word, the first is quiescent and the second vocal, e. g. יִשְׁמְרוּ, וַיֵּבְךְּ Gn 50:1, יִשְׁבְּ Jr 41:10, שַׂמְתְּ Is 47:7. In the last three instances the final Shewa is sounded with the initial letters of the following words

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[so Ḥayyuj N. 15f.]. Both final Shewas, however, are silent when followed by a word with a Shewa or compound Shewa under the initial letter [cf. Ibn Ezra, Ṣ. 2a], e. g. יַפְתְּ אֱלֹהִים Gn 9:27. Similarly, when the two Shewas are in a word in pause, both are silent, e. g. וַיֵּבְךְּ Gn 45:14. Some regard the two Shewas at the end of the word always silent.[31] In support of this theory we find in some exact Mss. וַיִּפְתְּ בְּסֵתֶר Jb 31:27, with Dagesh in the ב of בְּסֵתֶר, so also וְיֹלַדְתְּ בֵּן Ju 13:5. Similarly, in וַיִּשְׁבְּ ׀ מִמֶּנּוּ Nu 21:1, the Pasek after וַיִּשְׁבְּ indicates its being detached from the following word, hence the Shewa under the ב is silent.[32]

f. When two Shewas occur in the middle of the word, the second Shewa under the בגד כפת is vocal and has a Dagesh lene,[32a] e. g. יִשְׁבְּרוּ, בְּשִׁבְתְּךָ, etc.; but the rāfe of the ת in יָקְתְאֵל 2 K 14:7 and of the ד in יָקְדְעָם Jos 15:56 may be due to the laryngeal following them.

g. A vowel-less letter at the end of the word, except any of the letters אהוי is pronounced as a distinct quiescent [cf. above, note 15], although it has no Shewa: אָכַל, אָמַר, וַיֹּאמֶר. The Shewa is omitted in this case because no further evidence than the absence of a written quiescent [cf. above, ibid.] after it, is needed to prove its being vowel-less. It is, however, always present under the feminine suffix ךְ—to distinguish it from the masculine ךָ—, which is not ordinarily followed by a written quiescent. Hence, by force of analogy, it is never omitted in any final ךְ, e. g. יָדֵךְ, רַגְלֵךְ, אָזְנֵךְ, as well as in מֶלֶךְ, חֹשֶׁךְ, דֶּרֶךְ, etc. Similarly the Shewa occurs under any distinct quiescent after a vowel-less consonant, e. g. יֵשְׂטְ, וַיִּפְתְּ, וַיִּשְׁבְּ Pr 7:25; also in וַיִּחַדְּ Ex 18:9, where the Pathaḥ under the ח is euphonic for Shewa.[33]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

h. The Shewa is omitted in the consonantal ה at the end of the word and is replaced by a Mappiḳ (a point within the ה), which proves the ה to be either a radical or a pronominal suffix, e. g. גָּבַהּ Jb 22:12 כָּמַהּ Ps 63:2, יָדָהּ, רַגְלָהּ, etc.

§ 5. Dagesh[34] and Rāfe

a. The letters בגדכפת are always rāfe (soft) after a vocal Shewa,[35] e. g. כְּבַרְכְּמִישׁ, בְּגָדָיו, בְּבֵיתְךָ Is 10:9, etc. In שְׁתַּיִם and שְׁתֵּי Ben Asher reads a furtive (prosthetic) initial א, hence the Shewa under the ש is silent and the ת has a dagesh, even after מִ with Metheg: מִשְּׁתֵּים Jon 4:11 and after מַה connected with it by a Maḳḳef: מַה־שְּׁתֵּי Za 4:12[a] (but מִשְּׁתֵי Ju 16:28). The Palestinian pronunciation אֶשְׁתַּיִם and אֶשְׁתֵּי corroborates this reading.[36]

b. All other letters, besides בגדכפת, are pronounced either soft or hard [even when they have no Dagesh], according to whether they are preceded by Shewa or not, as the case may be,[37] e. g. in וְלָמָּה, וְשָׁאַל Nu 27:21, וְנָפְלוּ Am 8:14, the ל, ש and נ are pronounced soft; but in לָמָּה, שָׁאַל, שָׁאוֹל Gn 43:7, נָפְלוּ Gn 4:6, they are pronounced hard. The Yod, however, is always soft, except when it has a Dagesh.

c. When the letters בגדכפת follow a Shewa quiescens they have a Dagesh[a] except in a few cases such as מַלְכֵי, מַלְכוּת, מַלְכֵיהֶם, etc.[38] Some pronounce even these forms with Dagesh, as evidenced by some Sephardic Mss. of the Bible. Some of these forms are treated by the masoretes as soft (rāfe) at one time and hard (with Dagesh) at another,

a. **They are considered as one word, hence the Shewa of the ש is silent.**

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

e. g. בִּרְכַּי, בִּרְכֵּיהֶם, etc., are always hard, with the exception of two instances: בִּרְכֵיהֶם Ju 7:6 and בִּרְכוֹהִי Dan 6:11; so also רִשְׁפֵּי Cn 8:6 (hard) and רִשְׁפֵי Ps 76:4 (soft). In the Infinitive with the preposition ל the Shewa in the first radical is quiescent and is followed by Dagesh in the second radical, e. g. לִשְׁבֹּר, לִסְגֹּר, לַחְפֹּר, etc.; but לִסְבוֹב Nu 21:4 is rāfe according to Maḥzora Rabba; so also according to the Masora, all instances of לִצְבֹא, except one, Is 31:4, are rāfe.

§ 6. Assimilation and Strengthening (Sharpening) of Consonants.

a. The strengthening of consonants takes place in the following instances:

1. In cases of assimilation.

(a) Most frequently in the verbs primae radicalis Nun, e. g. הִבִּיט, הִגִּישׁ, etc.

(b) In some of the verbs primae radicalis Yod, whose middle radical is צ, e. g. הִצִּיב, הִצִּיג, etc.

(c) In the verb לָקַח on account of its very frequent use,[39] e. g. יִקַּח, etc.

b. 2. When the afformative and the final radical are the same letters, e. g. הַאְזֵנָּה Gn 4:23 (for הַאֲזֵנְנָה), וְלַנּוּ Ju 19:13 (for וְלַנְנוּ), נִצְמַתִּי Jb 23:17, שַׁתָּה Ps 90:8, מוֹתַתִּי 2S 1:16 (for מוֹתַתְתִּי) etc. [for further instances cf. below § 38].

3. Frequently in pause or in a letter pointed with Shewa for the sake of euphony, e. g. חָדֵלּוּ Ju 5:7, יִקְּהַת and עִקְּבֵי Gn 49:10.17 [see below § 16b].

c. In all these cases, the rejected letter is compensated by a Dagesh in the following consonant. There are, however,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

some exceptions, e. g. תְּאָמַנָה Is 60:4, יִקְחוּ Gn 14:24, נִסְעָה Gn 33:12, וַתִּתְצוּ Is 22:10, תְּדְּרוּ Dt 12:11 (according to a Hileli Ms. quoted by Jacob ben El'azar [on his identity see below, note 83]), etc. Similarly in מְשָׁרַת 1K 1:15 (for מְשָׁרַתַּת) there is no Dagesh Compensativum in the ת.

d. When the same consonant occurs twice in succession [with Shewa under the first] and is preceded by a long vowel, both consonants are distinctly pronounced, e. g. סֹבְבוּ Jos 6:15, כּוֹנְנוּ Ex 15:17, שׁוֹבְבָה Jr 8:5. When, however, they are preceded by a short vowel, one of them is assimilated in pronunciation [cf. Ben Asher, *Diḳ.* 31f.], e. g. רִבְבוֹת Dt 33:17, קִלְלַת ibid 21:23 [in our text these two words have Metheg under the initial letter], רִנְנַת Jb 20:6, etc. [but see below, f]. But when the short vowel has a Metheg both consonants are pronounced, the first having a Ḥatef Pathaḥ, e. g. גִּלֲלַי, מִלֲלַי Ne 12:36, הַמְלַקְקִים Ju 7:6, רִבֲבוֹת Nu 10:36 and Mi 6:7, קִלֲלַת Ju 9:57 and Pr 26:2 [in our text the example in Proverbs has no Metheg]. Only the first of the identical consonants is pronounced in מְחַצְצְרִים 1 Chr 15:24, יִרְאִיָּה Jr 37:13, וּמְחִיָּיאֵל Gn 4:18, and, according to Ben Asher, יִשָּׂשכָר Gn 30:18.

e. The same two consonants concurring in two adjacent words are pronounced, according to Saadia, with assimilation of one of the consonants by some and without assimilation by others,[40] e. g. בִּן־נוּן Ex 33:11 יָרוּץ צַדִּיק Pr 18:10, וְאֹזֵל לוֹ ibid 20:14, שִׁבְתָּהּ הַבַּיִת Ru 2:7, שָׁלַח חֹשֶׁךְ Ps 105:28, etc.[a] Ibn Janaḥ is of the opinion that in all these

a. Some grammarians maintain that the double accent in some of these examples purports to indicate distinctness in the pronunciation of the concurring identical letters. This is, however, untenable, in view

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

instances assimilation takes place [*Riḳ*. 141f.]. In proof of this contention he adduces the admonition of the Rabbis to pronounce distinctly the successive לs in אֶל־לְבָבֶךָ Dt 4:39, בְּכָל־לְבַבְכֶם and עַל־לְבַבְכֶם ibid 11:13.18, from which he infers that in all other instances assimilation is permissible. Assimilation takes place, according to him, even in the case of two concurring cognate letters, whether in the same word or in two successive words, e. g. וְהַעֲבַטְתָּ Dt 15:6, וּשְׁחַטְתֶּם 1S 14:34, וְיִתֶּן־לִי Gn 23:9, יַחְפֹּץ זְנָבוֹ Jb 40:17, בְּכֶסֶף וְזָהָב Ps 105:37, etc.

f. In my opinion, however, in all cases, concurring cognate or identical consonants are to be pronounced distinctly.[42] The special emphasis attached by the Rabbis to the pronunciation of the instances quoted from the Shema' prayer does not imply assimilation in all other cases. The reason for this particular emphasis is twofold: (1) the special significance of this prayer, (2) the fact that it is read twice daily by all Jews, both learned and ignorant. A special warning against mispronunciation was, therefore, deemed advisable. Similarly care should be taken to pronounce distinctly concurring identical letters, the first of which is rāfe (without Dagesh) and the second with Dagesh [cf. Ber. 15b], for the tendency is to assimilate in pronunciation a rāfe consonant into that with Dagesh, e. g. עֵשֶׂב בְּשָׂדְךָ Dt 11:15 הַכָּנָף פְּתִיל Nu 15:38 etc.[43]

of the numerous examples with double accent where there is no concurrence of identical letters, e. g. עֹרֵף כֶּלֶב Is 66:3, גָּרֵשׁ לֵץ Pr 22:10 פּוֹטֵר מַיִם ibid 17:14, etc.[42]

§ 7. Vowel Letters: Their Function, Influence and Changes[44]

a. The letters אוי are vowel letters and are called mothers by the author of *Sefer Yeṣira*,[45] for no word or letter can be pronounced without them.[46] They are also spirant consonants and frequently occur as such independently. Thus, each of the five long vowels which are the principal vowels, is followed by one of these vowel letters, whether written or latent: Ḳameṣ by א, Ṣere and Ḥireḳ by י, Ḥolem and Shureḳ by ו, e. g. צָנָאר, עֵילָם Gn 10:22, שָׂרִיד Nu 21:35, גִּבּוֹר, עוּגָב Gn 4:21. The א, however, in הֶהָלְכוּא Jos 10:24, נָשׂוּא Jr 10:5, לוּא Is 48:18 and in all cases of הוּא and הִיא, is pleonastic.[47]

b. The ה is also a vowel-letter, but it is not quiescent in the same degree as is the א; and, unlike the latter, retains its consonantal sound as a first radical in the middle of a word (e. g. יַהֲרֹג) and at the end of the following verbs גָּבַהּ, כָּמַהּ, תָּמַהּ, [and נָגַהּ]. When, however, it does quiesce it is governed by the same rules as the א.[48]

c. The ה in monosyllables, or when connected by Maḳḳef to a monosyllable, is sometimes preserved orthographically, though disregarded phonetically; for it is followed by a Dagesh forte which occurs only immediately [i. e. without intervention of either distinct or latent quiescent] after a short vowel, e. g. in every instance of מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר,[49] מַה־בֶּצַע Gn 37:26, מַה פָּרַצְתָּ ibid 38:29 נַכֶּה־בּוֹ Nu 22:6 and with ה entirely dropped: מַלְּכֶם Is 3:15, מַזֶּה Ex 4:2, מֶהֵם Ez 8:6. Similarly in the case of the other vowel-letters, e. g. בִּיקְּרוֹתֶיךָ Ps 45:10 (ב with Ḥireḳ according to Ben Naftali) [cf. above, note 28], לִיקְּהַת

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Pr 30:17, וַהֲמִיתִיו 1S 17:35, יולֵד Ju 18:29, הולְלוּ Ps 78:63, נוֹלְדוּ Gn 2:25 עֲרוּמִּים Ex 16:12, תְּלוּנּוֹת Ez 23:41, כְּבוּדָּה 1 Chr 20:8, כּוּלָּם Jr 31:33, הוּכָּה Ps 102:4, נְבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר 2 K 25:22, כַּאבִּיר Is 10:13, בְּסַאסְּאָה ib. 27:8, צַוְארֵי (in the last instance, the א, though retained orthographically, is entirely disregarded in pronunciation, as evidenced by the fact that the preceding Waw is vocalized with Shewa).

d. In general, all בגדכפת closely adjacent to אהוי are rāfe (without Dagesh),[a] except in the following cases:[51]

e. (a) מַפִּיק, when the אהוי letters have consonantal sounds, e. g. אֵלָיו פִּי Ps 66:17, שְׂפָתַי תִּפְתָּח ib. 51:17, וַעֲתִדָּהּ בַּשָּׂדֶה Pr 24:27 (except in three cases: קַרתָהוּ Is 34:11, שָׁלֵו בָהּ Ez 23:42, אֲדֹנָי בָם Ps 68:18).

f. (b) מַפְסִיק, when the preceding word has a disjunctive accent or a Pasek, e. g. וַאֲנִי בְּרוֹב חַסְדְּךָ Ps 5:8, עָשׂוּ׀ כָּלָה Gn 18:21.

g. (c) דְּחִיק, [when a monosyllable with a quiescent is joined by a Makkef to the following word], e. g. מַה־פָּרַצְתָּ Gn 38:29, מַה־תָּאֳרוֹ 1 S 28:14, etc.

h. (d) אָתֵי מֵרַחִיק, when a word ending in a toneless ה ָ or ה ֶ is connected to a monosyllable or to a word with the tone [or Metheg] on the initial syllable, e. g. וְזָבַחְתָּ פֶּסַח Dt 16:2, עֹשֶׂה כֹּל Is 44:24, יִבְנֶה־בַּיִת 2 Chr 2:11, וְעָשִׂיתָ קְּעָרֹתָיו Ex 25:29, etc. The case of קוּמוּ צְּאוּ Gn 19:14 may also belong here.[52]

i. When, however, the quiescent is retained in script after the Kameṣ the Dagesh is in most cases omitted, e. g.

a. This applies also to cases where the אהוי letters are latent, as in דָּגִים and שָׁבִים, but in בָּתִּים** the Dagesh in the ת serves to distinguish this word from בָּתָה Is 5:6.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

מָצְאָה בַיִת Ps 84:4, נֹסְסָה בוֹ Is 59:19, מָלְאָה גַת Joel 4:13 (the ג is spirant according to Ben Naftali), etc.

j. After ָה [cohortative], however, the Dagesh remains, e. g. קָבָה־לִּי Nu 22:11, הַנִּיחָה לִּי Ex 32:10, הִשָּׁבְעָה־לִּי Gn 25:33, הָבָה־לִּי Gn 30:1.

k. When two of the בגד כפת letters concur at the beginning of a word the first takes a Dagesh and a Shewa, the second is spirantized,[a] e. g. נִשְׁכְּבָה בְּבָשְׁתֵּנוּ Jr 3:25 [in our text בְבָשְׁתֵּנוּ, without Dagesh in the initial ב] בְּהִכָּבְדִי בְּפַרְעֹה Ex 14:18, הֵן אֲנִי כְּפִיךָ Jb 33:6, etc.[53]

l. *Rem.* 1. In the forms כַּדְכֹּד (after וְשַׂמְתִּי) Is 54:12 and כַּלְכֵּל (after ונלאיתי) Jr 20:9, the Dagesh is due to the spirants in the second half of the words.[54]

m. *Rem.* 2. The Dagesh in the following instances is exceptional:[55] גָאֹה גָּאָה Ex 15:21, מִי כָּמֹכָה ibid 11, זוּ גָּאָלְתָּ ibid 13, יִדְּמוּ כָּאָבֶן ibid 16, שַׂבְּכָא פְּסַנְתֵּרִין Dn 3:15, גְּדָבְרַיָּא דְּתָבְרַיָּא ibid 2, וְחָכְמָה כְּחָכְמַת ibid 5:11, and in some versions of the Masora גָּאַלְתָּ בִּזְרוֹעַ Ps 77:16 [in our text בִּזְרוֹעַ]. The Dagesh, however, in דְּתָבְרַיָּא and כְּחָכְמַת may be euphonic and due to the similarity in sound of the first two letters.

n. *Rem.* 3. The אוי letters after a Shewa do not make the following בגד כפת spirant, e. g. וַיַּרְא גַּעַל Ju 9:36, וַיַּרְא פַּרְעֹה Ex 9:34 etc.

o. The rules stated in this chapter regarding the effect of אהוי on the Dagesh in בגד כפת apply equally to all

a. except in the combination of בד, כד and בכ, e. g. או בְדַל אֹזֶן Am 3:12, עַתָּה כְדִבְרֵיכֶם Gn 44:10, כְּסֻכָּה בְכָרֶם Is 1:8. As to כג in כְּגַעַת Ez 17:10 and כְגֶבֶר Jb 38:3, Ben Asher differs with Ben Naftali, the former regarding the כ as spirant, the latter as pointed with Dagesh.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

consonants, but on account of the change in sound produced by the Dagesh on בגד כפת, they alone were mentioned.[56] The author of the *Sefer Yeṣira* regards the ר also as having a twofold pronunciation. We have, however, found no mention elsewhere to this effect, except in a treatise by Eli ben Yehuda ha-Nazir,[57] in which the author states that only Tiberians lend the ר a twofold pronunciation. These people, the author maintains, observe consistently the hard and spirant pronunciation of the ר both in speech and in reading. The rule as regards this twofold pronunciation is as follows: The ר is spirantized whenever the consonants זד"ט סצ"ת נ"ל having Shewa precede it, or whenever the Shewa-bearing ר precedes the consonants נ"ל, e. g. מִזְרָק, מִדְרָךְ, מִטְרוֹת, יִשְׂרָאֵל, סַרְנֵי, מִצְרַיִם, יִתְרָן, נֵר, עָרְלֵי, קַרְנֵי.[58]

p. Thus all the consonants (except the Yod, which, unless pointed with Dagesh, is always soft), besides בגד כפת, are pronounced hard, except when preceded by אהוי, e. g. יוֹצֵא מֵעִמְּךָ Ex 8:25, עָשָׂה לִי Dt 8:17, etc.

q. The letters אוי are sometimes dropped in writing though retained in pronunciation, e.g. רֵיחַ הַנִּיחוֹחַ Gn 8:21 [for רֵיאַח הַנִּיחוֹאַח], שׁוֹמֵעַ [for שׁוֹמֵאַע], יְרוּשָׁלַ͏ִם [for יְרוּשָׁלַאִם], נֹחַ [for נוֹאַח], דָּנִאֵל Ez 14:14.20.28 (in these three instances the Yod of דָּנִאֵל is pronounced although not written). Similarly a Waw is always pronounced after Ḥolem and Shureḳ, and a Yod after Ṣere and Ḥireḳ.

r. The letters אהו"י interchange in their capacity both as vowels and consonants in the following order:[59]

s. 1. א.

(a) Instead of Yod after Ṣere and Ḥireḳ. e. g. וְרָצֵאתִי Ez 43:27, צֵאת Gn 24:11.[60]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

(b) Instead of Waw after Ḥolem and Shureḳ, e. g. שׁאסַיִךְ Jr 30:16, פָּארָה Is 10:33.

(c) Instead of consonantal Hē, e. g. שֵׁנָא Ps 127:2, אֶתְחַבַּר 2 Chr 20:35, אֶגְאָלְתִּי Is 63:3, מַטָּרָא La 3:12, etc.

t. 2. ה.

(a) Instead of א e. g. הֵתָיוּ Jr 12:9, וְהֵיךְ Dn 10:17, בְּלַהֲטֵיהֶם Ex 7:11 (for בְּלָאֲטֵיהֶם from לְאַט 2S 19:5).

(b) Instead of Waw after both Ḥolem and Shureḳ, e. g. אָהֳלֹה Gn 12:8, בְּרֵעֹה Ex 32:17, הִזְהִירֹה 2K 6:10, שֻׁפְּכָה Ps 73:2, שְׁמָמָה Ez 35:12, etc.[60a]

u. 3. ו (Waw).

(a) Instead of Yod in the pronoun הוא in numerous instances.

v. 4. י (Yod).

(a) Instead of Waw, e. g. הִיא Ps 73:16 and Jb 31:11.

(b) Instead of א after Ḳameṣ, e. g. עָלָיו, יָדָיו, etc.[61] The vowel-letters, being quiescent and often latent, are dropped in both script and pronunciation in verbs in which one of the radicals is either Alef or Waw. The Yod, however, is never a third radical, except in חיי [cf. below § 40f' and note 324]. The Waw occurs only as a second radical, the Waw in וָלָד being in place of Yod, and in שָׁלֵו, אחו instead of ה.[61a] The ה is latent only as a third radical [cf. below § 40].

§ 8. The Tone and Pause

a. In verbs the tone always rests on the ultima in the third person, sing., masculine. In the perfect, first and second persons singular,[62] the tone rests on the penultima in all conjugations [see below § 16h].

b. When a word with the tone on the ultima is followed by a monosyllable, or by a word with the tone on the first

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

syllable,[63] the tone recedes from the ultima to the penultima, e. g. קָרָא לָיְלָה Gn 1:5, אָבַד כָּלַח Jb 30:2, etc. [see below § 16g]. In participles, however, the tone is retained on the ultima in the Ḳal sing. even before a tone-syllable, in order to prevent the Ṣere from changing to Segol, as a result of the loss of the tone, in which event it might be confused with nouns of the פֶּעֶל formation. Hence in the participles of the ל״ה verbs, where the second syllable has Segol anyway, but of which stem no nouns of the פֶּעֶל formation exist,[64] retraction of the tone does take place, e. g. בֹּנֶה עִיר Gn 4:17, בֹּנֶה חָיִץ Ez 13:10, etc. Likewise, in the ל״א verbs, the participle of which always has Ṣere in the second syllable, recession of the tone occurs, e. g. רֹפֵא לָךְ 2K 20:5 [see below § 22pq].

c. Under the influence of the Waw Consecutive [cf. below § 21 and note 100] the tone generally shifts from its original position, e. g. וְשָׁמַרְתָּ Dt 4:40, וַיְגָרֶשׁ Gn 3:24, etc.[65] In the verbs ל״א and ל״ה the Waw Consecutive has no effect on the tone, e. g. וְנָשָׂאתִי Gn 18:26, וְעָשִׂיתָ Ex 29:35. Similarly the tone remains unaffected by the Waw Consecutive, even in strong verbs, in the perfect, second person plural, and in the pausal forms, e. g. וִירִשְׁתֶּם Dt 11:23, וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם Ex 12:24.25, וְשָׂבָעְתָּ Dt 8:12, etc. [cf. below § 16h].[66]

d. In the verbs ע״ו and ע״ע the participles or adjectives and nouns are distinguishable in the Ḳal from the Perfect by the position of the tone. In the former the tone is on the ultima, in the latter—on the penultima, e. g. קָמָה (Perfect), קָמָה (participle or noun); תַּמָּה (Perfect), תַּמָּה (participle or adjective). There are, however, exceptions: שָׂמוּ Gn 40:15,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

תָּ֫רוּ Nu 13:32, צָ֫דוּ La 4:18 [in our text צָדוּ], וְשָׁ֫בָה Is 23:17, etc. [see below §§ 37d and 38b].

e. The tone is also on the penultima in nouns and verbs of the following formations [Segolates]: נַ֫עַר, אֹ֫זֶן, סֵ֫פֶר, מֶ֫לֶךְ, נֵ֫צַח, זֹ֫הַר, בַּ֫יִת, מָ֫וֶת (of the ע״ו stem), יָ֫שֵׁן, יַ֫עַל, הֶ֫רֶף, (but אַחַר and אֶחָד).[67]

f. In pause the vowel of the middle radical in the ground-form is retained and bears the tone, under the influence of which the Pathaḥ of the פָּעַל formations changes to Kameṣ, e. g. אָמָר Gn 21:1 [on the pausal form קָמֵל Is 33:9, see below § 16b], נָתָ֫נּוּ Ez 27:19 [on the Dagesh in pause see below, ibid. and note 84], וְשָׂמֵ֫חָה Es 8:15 and יָכֹ֫לוּ Ex 8:14. Similarly in the Imperative and in the Imperfect the יִפְעֹל (פְּעֹל) and יִפְעַל (פְּעַל) ground-forms are respectively retained in pause, with the Pathaḥ of the latter changed to Kameṣ[a] under the effect of the tone, e. g. תִּשְׁמֹ֫רוּ Dt 13:5, גְּזֹ֫רוּ 1K 3:26, תִּלְבָּ֫שִׁי Is 49:18, שְׁכָב 1S 3:5.6, etc. In pausal forms with Nun Paragogicum, however, the tone is attracted to the final syllable, e. g. תִּדְבָּקִין Ru 2:8.21, יִקְצֹרוּן ibid 2:9, etc. [cf. below § 18d and § 19b].

§ 9. The Change of the Vowels, particularly as effected by the Position of the Tone

a. When long vowels in closed syllables lose the tone, or have their tone weakened in the construct state, these vowels undergo the following changes:

b. The Kameṣ changes to Pathaḥ, e. g. דְּבַר־ה׳ Ez 1:3, etc.

a. There are, however, numerous instances in the Perfect in which the Pathaḥ is retained even in pause, e. g. זָקַ֫נְתִּי Gn 27:2, זָקַ֫נְתִּי ibid 18:13, וָמַ֫תִּי ibid 19:19, נָתַ֫שְׁתָּ Ps 9:7, הָלַ֫כְתִּי ibid 26:1, etc. [Cf. below §§ 16h, 19a, and 22f.].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

c. The Ṣere becomes Segol, or Ḥireḳ [particularly before a Dagesh], e. g. וַיְגָרֶשׁ Gn 3:24, בִּקֶּשׁ־לֵץ Pr 14:6, הִתְהַלֶּךְ־נֹחַ Gn 6:9, מְקַדִּשְׁכֶם Lv 21:8, אֲחִתְּךָ Jr. 1:17. [See below §§ 24d, 31c, 33b and 38l].

d. The Ḥolem changes to Ḳameṣ ḥatuf, or Ḳibbuṣ [especially before Dagesh], e. g. לִשְׁמָרְךָ Ex 23:20, מְלָךְ־מֶלֶךְ Gn 36:31, יִמְשָׁל־בָּם Is 19:4, מָעֻזִּי Jr 17:19, עֲבֻתָּה (from עָבֹת) Ez 6:13. [See below §§ 17a, 18a, 19a, and 49g].

e. The Shureḳ changes to Ḳibbuṣ, e. g. חֲרֻלִּים (from חָרוּל) Pr 24:31, מַלְכֻיוֹת (from מַלְכוּת) Dn 8:22.

f. The long Ḥireḳ changes to short Ḥireḳ (followed by Dagesh), e. g. ,הַמִּצְרִיּוֹת הָעִבְרִיּוֹת Ex 1:19, נָכְרִיָּה ibid 2:22.

g. Conversely, the short vowels are lengthened [in consequence of proximity to the tone, or of bearing it, also] when the following consonant does not take Dagesh, or when it quiesces. The short vowels are changed to the corresponding long vowels, in accordance with the order given above; namely, Pathaḥ is lengthened to Ḳameṣ, Segol and Ḥireḳ (short)—to Ṣere, Ḳameṣ ḥatuph and Ḳibbuṣ—to Ḥolem, Ḳibbuṣ—to Shureḳ, short Ḥireḳ—to long Ḥireḳ, e. g. שָׁמֵר, עָלַי (from עַל), עָלֶי, חָרָשׁ (of the גַּנָּב formation); עֵגֶל(cf. עֶגְלָה), בֵּרַךְ (analogous to בִּקֵּשׁ), מֵעֶרֶב Lv 23:32; כֹּל (cf. כָּל־), בֹּרַךְ (on the analogy of בֻּקַּשׁ); הוּלַּד (for הֻלַּד); מִימִין Za 4:3 [for מִיְמִין], יִישַׁן (for יִיְשַׁן), בִּיהוּדָה (for בִּיְהוּדָה) [cf. below § 75a, d].

h. Rem. Before a laryngeal with Ḳameṣ the open tone-less Pathaḥ sometimes changes to Segol,[68] e. g. וְהִטֶּהָרוּ Nu 8:7, וְיִתְנֶחָם ibid 23:19, נֶחָל (of the גַּנָּב formation), נֶחָמָה, בֶּהָלָה, נֶאָצָה Ne 9:18.26 (of the בַּקָּשָׁה formation) [cf. below §§ 27b, 53b, and 58c, also note 537].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOTES: CHAPTER ONE

[6] This classification is in the main as early as the *Sefer Yeṣira*, where the letters are said to be "engraved by the voice, hewn out in the air and fixed in the mouth in five places" (חֲקוּקוֹת בְּקוֹל, חֲצוּבוֹת בְּרוּחַ, קְבוּעוֹת בַּפֶּה בְּחָמֵשׁ מְקֹמוֹת) Yeṣira II, 3. Menaḥem (*Maḥ.* 6a) mentions only four groups: laryngeals, labials, palatals and linguals (the latter may also include the dentals). Dunash, in his introduction to his *Tesh. against Menaḥem*, 5b, mentions the fivefold division, without, however, referring to the organs of speech. Ibn Janaḥ's classification (*Riḳ.*, p. 5) is as follows: laryngeals, labials, palatals, linguals and dentals. Ibn Gabirol (*'Anaḳ* 147f.) bases his classification on Saadia, the order being: laryngeals, palatals, linguals, dentals and labials. The same order is followed by *Sefer Yeṣira* II, 4; by Ben Asher, *Diḳduḳe ha-Te'amim* (ed. S. Baer and H. L. Strack) pp. 6ff.; and by Ibn Ezra (*Ṣ.*, ed. Lipman, 12a). On the reasons for the ח preceding the ה in the arrangement of אחהע cf. Bacher's *Abraham Ibn Ezra* etc., chapter 7, also notes 4 and 5 ad. l. Modern grammarians usually accept in their classification of the consonants the scheme of the Hebrew phonetic system introduced by E. Sievers (*Metrische Studien* I, 14) which is as follows:

i. Throat sounds (Laryngeals): אההע

ii. Mouth-sounds:	Mutes and Spirants	Palatal	ק	כּכ גּג
		Dental	ט	תּת דּד
		Labial		פּפ בּב
	Sibilants	זסשׂשׁצ		
	Sonants	יולרמנ		

[7] Cf. below § 27c. The interchange of letters is treated in considerable detail by Ibn Janaḥ in *Riḳ.*, chapter 7. On the interchange of the אהוי letters see below § 7r-v.

[8] Numerous references to talmudic passages bearing on the similarity of the pronunciation of these letters may be found in Berliner's *Jahres-Bericht* (1878–1879), pp. 15–17 and 19f., also in Goldziher's Anzeige, *ZDMG* (1880), p. 378 and n. 1.

[9] The reference given here is to the following passage: אמר ליה רבי חייא לרבי שמעון בר רבי:. אלמלי אתה לוי פסול אתה מן הדוכן משום דעבי קולך'. אתא אמר ליה:. זיל איםא ליה כשאתה מגיע אצל, וחכיתי לה׳׳ לא

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[9] נמצאת מחרף ומגדף. Ḳimḥi, like most mediaeval Hebrew scholars, apparently quotes from memory, as evidenced by numerous erroneous biblical references (cf. Luzatto in *Oṣar Neḥmad* II, 34f.), and misquotes this passage, attributing wrongly to Rabbi Simeon, instead of Rabbi Ḥiyya, the defective pronunciation of the ח. Cf. *Mikhlol*, ed. Lyk, 73a: כמו שאמר ר' חייא לר' שמעון ברבי שהיה עלג בלשונו ואמר לו כשאתה מגיע אצל וחכיתי לה' (ישעיה ח') לא נמצא מחרף ומגדף כמוך. But it was Rabbi Simeon, according to our text, who was advised by his father to retort in this manner Ḥiyya's criticism of his coarse voice.

[10] This principle of metathesis was recognized and operated with to a considerable degree by earlier Hebrew grammarians. Cf. Judah Ibn Koreish (see references in Bacher's *Anf.*, p. 70, note 5), Abraham ha-Babli (Ms. published by M. A. Neubauer in *Journal Asiatique*, 1863, pp. 198–200; on his identity see Neubauer in the introduction, also M. Steinschneider in *Die Arabische Literatur der Juden*, p. 86), and Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 207f.). See also Ben Asher, *Diḳ*. 9f. On examples of metathesis in Indo-European languages see *Introduction to the Study of the History of Language* by Strong H. A., Logeman W. S., and Wheeler B. I., 1891, p. 37f.

[11] Joseph Ḳimḥi was the first to introduce systematically the notion of quantitative distinction and, consequently, of the tenfold division of the vowel system in Hebrew, which was adopted by the subsequent Hebrew grammarians. He was probably led to it under the influence of the Latin languages employed in the Provence where he lived. His predecessors knew of seven vowels (kings) only, basing themselves on the masoretic tradition of the vowel signs, and they did not differentiate in name between Ḳameṣ ḥatuf and long Ḳameṣ, between short and long Ḥireḳ, and between Ḳibbuṣ and Shureḳ (cf. Ben Asher, *Diḳ*. 11f.; Dunash, *Tesh. ag. Menaḥem*, 5b; Ḥayyuj, Nutt, p. 4; etc.). Ḥayyuj, in whose system vowel changes play an important part, seems to have recognized the distinction between long and short vowels, and he resorts to the explanation that every long vowel is followed by a written, or unwritten (latent), quiescent, i. e., by the sound of one of the letters אוי. Thus, the Ḥolem in שׁכּוֹר is long because of the written quiescent Waw, while in the Ḳameṣ of שָׁמַר the quiescent א is latent (שָׁמַר = שָׁאמַר), etc. (N., 6–7). It is clear, however, that neither the babylonian nor the tiberian vowel-system points to any quantitative distinction of vowels. This distinction depends chiefly on the form of the word: whether it is written plene or defective, or, perhaps also, whether it is pausal or non-pausal. It certainly seems artificial to regard, for example,

Digitized by Google	Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

in the pausal form קָמֵל Is 33:9, the pausal Pathaḥ as short and the pretonic Ḳameṣ as long, or to read the Ṣere of the construct form שְׂדֵה as long and the Segol of the absolute form שָׂדֶה as short. This difficulty was apparently sensed already by Joseph and David Ḳimḥi, and they suggest conditions under which the short vowels are lengthened and the long vowels are shortened; cf. *Zik.* 17f. and below e-k. See also Ges.-K. § 8, Preliminary Remark.

[12] Ibn Janaḥ (*Opuscules*, ed. J. and H. Derenbourg, 275–7) suggests the following scheme of the development of the vowels: The three original, or primitive, vowels are Shureḳ, Ḥireḳ, and Pathaḥ. These correspond to the three types of motion in nature. Thus, the vocal organs producing the Shureḳ raise its sound upward, resembling the ascending movement of fire. The Ḥireḳ is produced by forcing the sound downward corresponding to the movement of a falling stone. The Pathaḥ, which is produced by a rotary movement of the vocal organs, corresponds to the movement of the heavens around the earth. These three vowels are "the mothers" and primitive vowels, from which all the other vowels, "the daughters," originated. The Shureḳ gave rise to the Ḳameṣ and Ḥolem, the Pathaḥ to the Segol, and the Ḥirek to the Ṣere. A similar treatment of the vowels is found in Ibn Ezra (Bacher, *Ibn Ezra* etc., Chapt. IX) and by Judah Halevi (*Kusari*, 182f.). The Shureḳ, as a primitive vowel in Ibn Janaḥ's system, is replaced by Ḥolem in Ibn Ezra's arrangement and by Ḳameṣ in that of Judah Halevi. This classification, which is based on the Arabic, is already found in Dunash ibn Tamim's comment. on *Yeṣira*, ed. Grosberg, p. 20f. It has been revived and, in the main, accepted by modern grammarians (cf. Ges.-K. § 7a). On the history and development of the three vowel-systems in Hebrew: the Palestinian, the Babylonian and Tiberian, as well as their interrelationship, see Budde, *Noeldeke's Festschrift* 651–7; Ges.-K. § 8gN; and Kahle in Bauer-Leander 93ff. Cf. also E. Hommel, *Hebräische Lautlehre*, Leipzig, 1917, p. 52.

[13] On the etymology of the terms applied to the respective vowels and their pronunciation see Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc., Chap. 9, and Kahle op. cit. 95ff.

[14] The masoretes usually designate Ḳameṣ and Ṣere by Ḳameṣ, and Pathaḥ and Segol by Pathaḥ; cf. Mas. Magna on Gn 4:2:—רעה ד׳ דבוקים וקמצין and ibid. 4:20:—ומקנה ו׳ נ׳ פתחין וג׳ קמצין "there are four examples of רעה in the construct state with Ḳameṣ (namely, Ṣere)" . . . "ומקנה occurs six times, three instances have Pathaḥ (i. e. Segol) and three-Ḳameṣ (i. e. Ṣere)." This points to the early history of the vowel-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

system, when Ḳameṣ and Pathaḥ were the only terms used, one to denote vowels pronounced with the mouth partly closed (Ḳameṣ), the other—with the mouth widely open (Pathaḥ); cf. Kahle op. cit. As to the pronunciation of the Ḳameṣ, differences of opinion and inconsistencies prevail among the Spanish Jewish grammarians. Generally, they operate with the pronunciation of ā for a long Ḳameṣ and ŏ for the Ḳameṣ ḥatuf. Yet, Ibn Ezra maintains (Ṣ. 3b) that only the Jews of Tiberias, Egypt and Africa, over against those of Spain, pronounce the Ḳameṣ correctly, namely, *o*. Similarly, Ibn Janaḥ in his classification of the vowels (see above, note 12) refers the Ḳameṣ to the same category with the Ḥolem and the Shureḳ; from which it is to be inferred that he, likewise, regarded the Ḳameṣ as similar in pronunciation to these two vowels, or *o*, rather than to the Pathaḥ; the latter belonging, according to him, in an entirely different category. See also *Kusari* 182 and note 3, also below, note 27. It is quite obvious that the masoretes did not differentiate in pronunciation between long and hurried Ḳameṣ. Thus, Ben Asher, in adducing examples to illustrate the change of Ḥolem to Ḳameṣ, includes in the same category the change of חֹדֶשׁ to חֳדָשִׁים, שִׁבֹּלֶת to שִׁבֳּלִים and of יוֹם to יָמִים (*Diḳ.*, p. 35). It is improbable that the Naḳdanim who were so careful to designate every shade of phonetic difference, such as that between the Ṣere and the Segol and between the Ḥolem and the Ḳameṣ ḥatuf, would employ the same symbol for two vowels so different in quality as ŏ and ā. If they intended to indicate quantitative differences, they would also have devised different signs to distinguish between long and short Ḥireḳ. The dissimilation of the Pathaḥ to Segol before a Ḳameṣ in laryngeals (cf. below § 9, rem.), while the same vowel remains unchanged even before an accented Pathaḥ (cf. אֶחָת; but נְחָלִים, נְחָמָה, etc.), testifies further to the absence of any difference in pronunciation between long and hurried Ḳameṣ among the Naḳdanim. This difference was, however, still prevalent in LXX and Josephus, but it began to break down in the time of Jerome and is entirely absent in the pronunciation of many Jews in modern times (cf. Ges.-Bergstrasser § 10a); although it has been adopted by the Jews of modern Palestine, where the Sephardic pronunciation is generally in vogue. Cf. also Kahle in Bauer-Leander 99f.

15 The term quiescent, or latent quiescent (Hebrew נָח, נָח נֶעְלָם, or נָח נִסְתָּר = Arabic *sākin layyin*) was employed by the mediaeval grammarians, after Ḥayyuj and the Arabic grammarians, to designate the sound-character of the אהוי letters, cf. above, note 11. The term נָח נִרְאֶה (distinct quiescent) is used to denote a vowelless consonant, other than אהוי.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[16] On the close kinship in sound between the Shureḳ, or Ḳibbuṣ, and the Ḥireḳ (cf. French *u* and German *ü*), traces of which are still extant in the pronunciation of the Polish Jews, see below, notes 93 and 219; Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. 63; also, more elaborately, Pinsker's commentary to Ibn Ezra's *Yesod Mispar*, attached to *Mabo*, p. 153 ff., note 103. The Polish Jews, Pinsker maintains, received this pronunciation from the Palestinian Jews via Caucasia, the land of the Khazars, and Crimea; whilst the Sephardic Jews got their pronunciation of the Shureḳ (*ū*) from the Babylonian Jews via Africa. On the basis of this kinship Pinsker explains plausibly many peculiar grammatical constructions; to which may be added numerous examples cited by Rabinovitz-Avronin in the introduction to their commentary on Job, p. 19. This may also shed light on the peculiar forms of the pronouns and pronominal suffixes אָנֹכִי, אַתֶּם, –כֶם, הֵם, –הֶם, from the ground-forms* *'anāku* (*'ana*+demonstrative—*ku*),* *'antumu*,*—*kumu*,* *humu*,*—*humu*; respectively. Cf. also Koenig I, 128f., 193, and 215. The influence of the Babylonian pronunciation of Hebrew on the Sephardic pronunciation is also evidenced by the sounding of the Ḳameṣ, *ā*, and is to be traced to the fact that in the 11th century the Babylonian Jews were the founders of Jewish scholarship in Spain (cf. Graetz, *Gesch.* V, chap. 11).

[17] The technical term employed by Ḳimḥi for pronouncing a vowel short is הַשְׁפָּל הַקְּרִיאָה or הַשְׁפָּל (lowering or deepening the pronunciation). On the meaning of this term see E. Hommel, *Hebräische Lautlehre*, chap. IV, particularly pp. 51f. and 102f.

[18] That Ḥatef Ḳameṣ may take the place of Ḳameṣ ḥatuf and have the same sound value seems to be the view also of Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 101). Cf. also below, note 432. The mediaeval grammarians seem to make no distinction between Ḳameṣ ḥatuf and Ḥatef Ḳameṣ, and they employ the term קמץ חטף or חטף קמץ with reference to either; cf. Joseph Ḳimḥi, *Zik*. 17 and Ben Asher, *Dik*. 14.

[19] Baer (*Torath Emeth* p. 9, note **) regards the Shewa in all these instances as quiescent. Every Shewa, according to him, preceded by any of the vowels is silent, except when it occurs under a laryngeal or under the first of the same two consonants in succession, in which case it is designated by an additional vowel (Ḥatef), e. g. הַמְשֹׁוֹרְרִים וְהַשּׁוֹעֲרִים Ne 12:45, גַּהֲרֵי נַחֲלֵי Jb 20:17, בְּתוֹכְכֶם Ex 12:49, תוֹכְךָ, Ez 28:16, הוֹלִיכְךָ Dt 8:2.16, etc. In proof of this he adduces the testimony of Ben Asher, Ibn Bal'am, and Ibn Ezra (Cf. *Ṣ*. 11 concerning the Shewa in חַשְׁבִי, also *Moz*. 7a and 28a relative to the Shewas under the ל in

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

וּלְקַחְתֶּם and וּלְבִנְיָמִין and under the ס in יֵאָסְפוּ Ezr 9:4). This is also borne out, Baer maintains, by the Te'amim (accents), e. g. וַאֲשֶׁר תֹּאמְרוּ Gn 34:11, וְאַךְ אוֹתְךָ Ex 9:15, לֹא תֵצְאוּ ibid 12:22, אֲשֶׁר פָּקְדוּ Nu 26:64, etc.; where the tebir (ֽ) is preceded by Merkha (֥), which, according to the law of accents, is possible only when they are separated from each other by a single syllable. The Metheg in all these instances, which misled the grammarians to regard the Shewa following it as mobile, is merely intended to give the respective vowels to which it is attached their full value. Cf. also Luzzatto's comment on this note and Baer's reply. The pronunciation of the "Shewa mobile" is still a moot question, although preponderant proof is adduced in recent grammatical literature substantiating Baer's contention (Cf. M. L. Margolis, *AJSL.* XXVI, 62ff.; Bauer-Leander 168, n. 3; and Ges.-Bergstrasser § 21v). It is hardly plausible that a living pronunciation will be bound by such artificial and intricate rules as those operating in the distinction between the Shewa mobile and the Shewa quiescens. Cf., for example, the Syriac forms *bishtā, bethūltā, kōthbin*, and the Biblical-Aramaic וּגְבוּרְתָּא Dn 2:20, עֲבִידְתָּא ibid 2:49, and מְדִינְתָּא Ezr 5:8; in all of which the hard pronunciation of the בגד כפת is retained after this type of Shewa. See also below, note 24.

[20] The discussion which follows, relative to the lengthening of the short vowels and the shortening of the long vowels, is taken in the main from Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik.* 17f.).

[21] In such instances the tone-bearing Segol is regarded by both Ḥayyuj (N. 123) and Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 290) as being in place of Ṣere and entailing a latent quiescent, since there is no qualitative distinction in the Sephardic pronunciation between the Ṣere and the Segol. Cf. in this connection also Karl Budde, "Orientalische Studien," *Noeldeke's Festschrift* II, 655, n. 2.

[22] A great deal of confusion seems to prevail among the Spanish Hebrew grammarians with regard to the distinction between long and hurried Ḳameṣ. Every Ḳameṣ accompanied by Metheg or accent, or followed by a sounded laryngeal (whether with compound Shewa or vowel), is regarded by them as long; cf. Ḥayyuj (N. 126), Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 101 and 221) and Ḳimḥi (below § 47c[1]). "But neither the origin of these forms, nor the analogous formations in Hebrew and in the cognate languages, nor the transcription of proper names in the LXX, allows us to regard this view as correct" (Ges.-K. § 9v). Compare in this connection the transliteration of אָהֳלָה (Oholah) and אָהֳלִיבָה (Oholibah) (Ez 23:4, etc.), while in the case of נָעֳמִי Ruth 1:2, etc.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

(transcr. Noemi by both the LXX and the Vulgate) the reading נָעֳמִי is probably assumed (cf. וְתָאֳרוֹ Is 52:14 alongside of תָּאֳרוֹ 1S 28:14, see below § 47c[1]). The mediaeval Jewishg rammarians were led to their erroneous view by the fact that every long Ḳameṣ, which usually occurs in an open syllable and was pronounced by the Palestinians as *o* (cf. above, note 14), was changed in the Sephardic pronunciation to *ā*. They, therefore, extended this principle to every Ḳameṣ in an open syllable. Thus, also in כָּל Ps 35:10, Pr 19:7 and, according to Judah b. 'Alan (cf. below, note 57), Dt 15:19, the Ḳameṣ was pronounced by them long on account of its bearing the tone (cf. Norzi on Dt 15:19). Ben Asher, *Diḳ.* § 47, includes also וְכָל Is 40:12, but this is Perfect of כול and does not belong to this category. Ibn Janaḥ reads as long also the initial Ḳameṣ in the following instances: הָשַּׁמָּה Lv 26:34, שָׁדְדָה Na 3:7 (*Opusc.* 197), קָלוֹהָ Jr 50:26, נָזְי ibid 7:29 (ibid 214); while according to Ḳimḥi (below § 38h) the Ḳameṣ in all these instances is hurried. Among the modern grammarians, Delitzsch (quoted by Koenig I, 105 and 106) is particularly pronounced in favor of Ḳimḥi's opinion, but see Koenig's elaborate treatment (*Lgb.* I, 104ff.). In modern Palestinian pronunciation every Ḳameṣ derived from the Hebrew Ḥolem or Ḳibbuṣ (= Arabic *u*-sound) is pronounced as Ḳameṣ ḥatuf. This seems to be prompted by sound linguistic sense (cf. Koenig, ibid. 106). But see above, note 14.

[23] This dispute is mentioned by Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 197), who quotes the former opinion from אנשים אחרים and rejects it, construing the form as Perfect. This latter opinion, Ibn Janaḥ reports to have found in a book of a scholar from Jerusalem (on his identity see Bacher, *REJ.* XXX, 233). In our text, likewise, the Ḳameṣ under the כ is accompanied by Metheg, supporting Ibn Janaḥ's view. But Ginsburg s.v. כרת brings a masoretic reading: כָּרְתוּ ב' וסימן כרתו יערה נאם ה' (ירמיה מו כג) כרתו עצה ושפכו על ירושלים סוללה (ירמיה ו' ו'). This word is, accordingly, read with Ḥireḳ under the כ and is construed as an Imperative. It is taken in the same sense also by the Targum and the ancient versions.

[24] The Metheg is, accordingly, a part of the vowel system and is not related at all to the system of accents, as is generally presumed by the moderns. This sign was apparently devised to call the attention of the reader to certain phonetic peculiarities and to warn him against slurring over weak consonants (אהחער) and unprotected vowels (vowels in an open syllable) which are too remote from the tone. Hence, it is attached: (a) to a "long" vowel in a closed syllable (שׁוֹטְרִים, הָיְתָה,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

בָּתִּים, אָנָּא), (b) before a composite Shewa (מֶאֱסוֹ, יֶאֱסוֹף, צֶהֱבַיִם), (c) before the first radical in היה and חיה with silent Shewa (יִהְיֶה, נֶחְיֶה, etc.), (d) to a vowel in an open syllable before the pretonic syllable (חֵירְתִי, הָאַרְבָּעִים, יַעֲמְדוּ, שָׁבוּעוֹת). This seems to have been the traditional view on the function of the Metheg held by the masoretes and by the mediaeval grammarians, witness the term מַאֲרִיךְ (lengthener) generally employed by them for this sign (cf. Mas. note ad Josh 5:8; Ḳimḥi, *Mikh.* 10a, etc.; etc.). The same opinion is to be inferred from the discussions of the Metheg by Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik.* 17), by the anonymous author of הוריות הקורא (*Journal Asiatique*, 6th ser., XVI, 327), and by Elias Levita (טוּב טעם, chap. 7). The latter distinctly states that although the Metheg resembles an accent (Silluḳ) in form, it is not to be regarded as such (שֶׁהיא דומה להמונת טעם אבל אינה טעם). The term Metheg employed by the moderns was not originated by Elias Levita, as suggested by Ben Yehuda s.v., since it is found already in Joseph Ḳimḥi's *Zik.* (op. cit.). The example חֵירְתְךָ cited here by David Ḳimḥi is irrelevant, unless he read it Mil'el. In Joseph Ḳimḥi's treatment of this point, which is the basis of the present discussion in the text, this example is not mentioned.

[25] This term is variously spelled by the mediaeval Hebrew grammarians. Some (Menaḥem, Ibn Janaḥ, Joseph and Moses Ḳimḥi, Parḥon, etc.) write it with ב as the middle letter; while others (Ben Asher, Ibn Ezra, David Ḳimḥi, etc.) write it with Waw. The former probably derive it from the stem ישב and construe it as the equivalent of the Arabic *sukūn* (rest), while the latter seem to connect it with שָׁוְא (nothingness); cf. Kahle in Bauer-Leander § 7h. An entirely different etymology is suggested by Ibn Ezra, Bacher's *Ibn Esra* etc., 64 and note 17, and by Bacher himself, *ZDMG.* 1895, p. 18, note 3.

[26] The pronunciation of the Shewa is similarly treated by Ben Naftali, Ḥayyuj (N. 4f. and 130f.), Ibn Ezra (*Ṣ.* 3) and Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik.* 18ff.). Ben Asher (*Diḳ.* 12f.) reads the Shewa without Ga'ya as Segol, with Ga'ya as Pathaḥ. This masoretic tradition relative to the pronunciation of the Shewa is substantiated to a considerable degree by evidence based on Hexaplaric material (cf. M. L. Margolis *AJSL.* XXVI, 65ff.).

[27] According to Ḥayyuj (N. 131), however, a Shewa preceding a laryngeal with a Ḳameṣ is assimilated for euphonic reasons to Pathaḥ and not to Ḳameṣ. This would imply that Ḥayyuj, likewise, made a qualitative distinction between Pathaḥ and Ḳameṣ, probably pronouncing the latter *o*; cf. above, note 14.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[28] "A Shewa at the beginning of a word followed by a Yod is pronounced like Ḥireḳ (ִי)," Ben Asher in *Diḳ*. 13f. This rule bears on the differences between Ben Asher and Ben Naftali in the reading of לירְאָה Dt 28:58, ליזְרְעֶאל 1K 4:12 and ביקרוֹתֶיךָ Ps 45:10, where the former reads Shewa under the prefixes and Ḥireḳ under the Yod; while the latter reads Ḥireḳ under the prefixes: לִירְאָה, ליזְרְעֶאל, בִּיקְרוֹתֶיךָ. Our texts adopted Ben Naftali's reading of בִּיקְרוֹתֶיךָ, which was also apparently the reading of Saadia and Dunash, since Saadia is inclined to disregard the Yod entirely and to construe this word as plural of בְּקָרֶת for which he is attacked by Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Saadia*, ed. Schroeter, pp. 4 and 12). The latter regards the Yod as a quiescent radical.

[29] The full quotation given in the text (Lyk ed. 138b) is וַיֵּדְעוּ בְּיַעֲקֹב וְלֹא יְיַחֵל, of which only the last two words occur in loc. cit. The word וְלֹא, however, was inserted by the editor in place of בְּיוֹם, on the basis of our masoretic text (cf. ibid., Addenda et Corrigunda, p. 201b). The latter word was also found in a Ms. of Luzzatto, in which, furthermore, וַיְּדְעוּ occurs in place of וַיֵּדְעוּ. Rittenberg, the editor, is therefore of the opinion that these four words are detached and independent illustrations of the effect of the Yod on the pronunciation of the preceding Shewa, and are not intended to represent a connected sentence. The biblical reference, accordingly, bears only on the last word יְיַחֵל. This seems plausible.

[29a] In both the Lyk and Fiordo editions the quotation is וידעו כי אל' משל ביעקב, with Ga'ya under the first ב of ביעקב. But according to *Minḥath Shai* ad l. Ḳimḥi refers here to וַיֵּדְעוּ. This word occurs with Ga'ya also in Ginsburg's edition, while ביעקב is without Ga'ya.

[30] Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik*. 19) gives the Shewa with Ga'ya the full value of Ḳameṣ gadol.

[31] So Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc*. 275) and Ibn Ezra (*Moz*., p. 3). The latter refers to Ḥayyuj's opinion as that of "some people" (יֵשׁ אנשים), and he definitely rejects it on the ground that in יַפְתְּ אֱלֹהִים Gn 9:27 a Ḥatef Segol follows the second Shewa, which would be impossible if it were vocal, also because of the pausal accent in וַיֵּבְךְּ Gn 27:38 and ibid 45:14. See the following note.

[32] Among the modern Jewish grammarians Luzzatto and Pinsker are at variance with regard to the pronunciation of this Shewa. The former regards it, with Ibn Janaḥ and Ibn Ezra, as silent and adduces proofs on the basis of the accents (grammatical extract quoted in *Igroth*, ed. Graber, I, 62f.). The latter proves very plausibly, both by

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the accents and by the Dagesh in the letters under which the Shewa occurs, that this final Shewa was pronounced, as maintained by Ḥayyuj, vocal (*Mabo* 92, note, and addendum 15 on p. 182). So also Brockelmann *GvG*. I, 216.

33 According to an opinion quoted by Ibn Chiquitilla (adnot. to Ḥayyuj, N. 76) "this Pathaḥ is due to the laryngeal ח, inasmuch as the ר has both Dagesh and Shewa." So also the moderns (cf. Bauer-Leander 214).

34 On the history of the development of the Dagesh and its varied significance see Pinsker, *Mabo* 6f. and 70ff., also below, note 52. On the extent to which the Dagesh, or its equivalent symbols, is used in the available Mss. of the Palestinian, Babylonian, and Tiberian vowel-systems see Kahle, Bauer-Leander 121ff.

35 The Dagesh to which Ḳimḥi refers in this section is the Dagesh lene (דָּגֵשׁ קַל), which occurs in the consonants בגד כפת only at the beginning of a word, or after a vowel-less consonant, never after a vowel or semi-vowel (vocal or composite Shewa). The spirantization of these originally explosive or hard consonants in the latter case is due to the partial assimilation of these consonants to the open-lip position of the vowels (cf. English *have* < Lat. *habeo*, French *savant* < Lat. *sapiens*). Cf. in this connection Jespersen, *Language*, p. 265, also below, note 105.

36 Ibn Ezra and Judah Halevi, likewise, record this pronunciation (cf. Parḥon, *'Aruk*, ed. Stern, 4c). In the Hebrew text of the *Mikhlo* (ed. Lyk 140a) Ḳimḥi refers this reading to אנשי מזרח, but as was already proved by Pinsker (*Mabo* 142, note 42) Ḳimḥi could not have meant the Easterners (Babylonians), but rather the Palestinians and Tiberians, also those living in Egypt, Africa, and the West (בני מערב). On the Dagesh of the ת in שְׁתַּיִם see below § 69c and note 594.

37 This statement apparently bears traces of the ancient masoretic tradition, embodied in several extant Mss. of the Bible, according to which all consonants, except the laryngeals and ר, take Dagesh Ḳal when preceded by a closed syllable or disjunctive accent; or, else, are designated by a Rāfe sign (cf. Kahle, Bauer-Leander § 8b'). A Ms. of the Pentateuch thus vocalized came to the attention also of Solomon Hanau (17th century), cf. Ṣohar ha-Tebah 25. Distinct reference to such Mss. is inferred by Kahle from a statement by Menaḥem in *Maḥ*. 6. Cf. also below, note 56.

38 The Shewa in these instances, as well as in the case of the imperative forms כִּתְבוּ, שִׁכְבוּ, etc., and with the prefixed prepositions בכל

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

(e. g. בְּדְבָר, כִּדְבָר, etc.) was regarded as silent by the early grammarians. In order to explain the spirant בגד כפת in these instances Solomon Hanau advanced the theory of the "light" or "weak" vowel (תְּנוּעָה קַלָּה). According to this theory the vowel preceding this Shewa is in itself a weak vowel, being in place of a Shewa (מַלְכֵי < מְלָכִים, שְׁבָבוּ < שְׁבָב, etc.) and does not take either Metheg or accent in case of נָסוֹג אָחוֹר. The following Shewa is, therefore, mobile, hence the absence of Dagesh in the בגד כפת following it. A similar explanation was that of Ges. § 10 and Ewald § 89, accepted also by Koenig I, 69, who regard this initial syllable as "loosely closed" or "wavering" and distinguish this Shewa as *Shewa medium*. The initial vowel in these examples is, however, an original Semitic vowel and forms a closed syllable with the Shewa following it (cf. examples adduced from Hexaplaric material by Margolis *AJSL*, XXVI, 67). The בגד כפת following this syllable are spirant, because the change from hard to spirant antedates the elision of the preceding vowel, the original *malakai* having become *malakhai* before it was shortened to *malkhe* (cf. Siever's *Metrische Studien* I, 22).

39 So Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 247), who explains it further on the ground that the ל and the נ are homo-organic. Cf. also below, note 191.

40 Saadia is here incorrectly quoted by Ḳimḥi, according to Bacher (*Anf.* 48, note 1). In *Riḳ.* 141, from which Ḳimḥi probably quotes, Ibn Janaḥ refers to a statement attributed to Saadia relative to the assimilation of the Nun in בְּרְנוּן only. The rest is Ibn Janaḥ's own augmentation. Ḳimḥi confuses here Saadia's opinion with that of Ibn Janaḥ, or he may be quoting from an entirely different source of Saadia (cf. *Saadia*, ed. Harkavy, p. 103f.).

41 Both the argument of these grammarians and the refutation thereof given here are found in *Riḳma*, op. cit.

42 The same opinion is expressed by the editors on *Opuscules d'Abou'l Walid* in the introduction, pp. XC-XCI But this sounds inconsistent with Ḳimḥi's opinion above, d.

43 Berliner (*Jahres-Bericht*, 1878–1879, pp. 17 and 22) wants to infer from this injunction that both the ב and the פ (with Dagesh) and the ב and the פ (rāfe) were spirantized. See, however, Goldziher's objections in *ZDMG*, 1880, p. 378.

44 See Ḥayyuj (N. 6f.) and Ibn Janaḥ's commentary in *Opusc.* 291. Cf. also note 48 below.

45 Not the author, but the commentator of the *Sefer Yeṣira*, Dunash Ibn Tamim, refers to these letters exegetically (cf. *Sefer Yeṣira*, ed. Grosberg, p. 20). Kahle (Bauer-Leander 92, note 2), in referring to this

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

early record of the Matres Lectionis in *Sefer Yeṣira*, probably, bases himself on this statement of Ḳimḥi.

[46] This seems to imply that even the short vowels cannot be pronounced without the quiescents אהוי, which contradicts the author's own statement above § 3b. The present view, however, is in consonance with some of the mediaeval grammarians, according to whom these letters actually represent all vowels, cf., Dunash Ibn Tamim, op. cit., p. 48.

[47] The א in some of these instances "might be regarded only as an orthographic addition closing the final vowel" Ges.-K. § 32k. Cf. also note 323 below.

[48] The function of the ה as a vowel-letter does not seem to be definitely established in the minds of some of the earlier grammarians. It is regarded by them merely as a substitute for one of its cognate letters אוי particularly for the א; cf. Ḥayyuj (N. 7) and Ibn Ezra (*Yesod* 17). But Ibn Janaḥ, in an elaborate and ingenious discussion, sets out to prove that Ḥayyuj does include the ה in the category of vowel-letters, his critics notwithstanding (*cf. Opusc.* 292ff.). In point of fact, the ה was probably one of the earliest of the four letters to be employed for the purpose of indicating vowels; primarily, a final *ō* in the pronominal suffix of the third per. sing. masc. (so throughout the Mesha inscription and in numerous biblical instances; cf. עִירֹה and סוּתֹה Gn 49:11, also below § 46e); later also in other final vowels (cf. the locative ־ָה, as in אַרְצָה, קֵדְמָה; in the feminine ending ־ָה, and in the inflexions of the ל״ה verbs, e. g. גָּלָה, יִגְלֶה, גְּלֵה, יִפֶּה). In the middle of the word it is found only in proper nouns, e. g. עֲשָׂהאֵל, פְּדָהצוּר. In most of these instances the vowel-letter can be traced back to an original consonant. Thus the suffix ־ֹה arose from *ahū* (cf. below, loc. cit. and note 386). The locative ־ָה evolved from an original *hā* (cf. Stade § 28b). So also in the fem. ending (cf. below, note 365). On the ה in the ל״ה formations cf. below, note 301. The employment of the other letters (אוי) in the same capacity probably arose in the identical manner, namely, in consequence of contraction or coalescence of these originally consonantal letters with the respectively preceding vowels. Thus, the originally consonantal א coalesced with the preceding *ă* into *ā*; the *ă* and the Waw contracted into *au* and further into *ō*, *ŭ* and Waw—into *ū*; while the Yod quiesced with the preceding *ă* into *ai* and further into *ē*, and with the preceding *ĭ*—into *ī*; e. g. מָצָאתָ (for *מָצַאְתָּ), נוֹלַד (for *נִוְלַד), הוֹלַד (for *הֻוְלַד), בֵּיתוֹ (for *בַּיְתוֹ), etc. These vowel-letters thus had originally etymological significance, but gradually

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

came to suggest certain particular vowels, and their use was extended in this capacity even to cases where they did not belong etymologically, e. g. בָּנָה, שָׂדֶה, גָּדוֹל, כָּתוּב, גְּבִיר, הִשְׁלִיךְ. In talmudic Hebrew the Waw and the Yod are widely employed to denote also short vowels, e. g. לאומרו (for לְאָמְרוֹ, common in the Talmud), מכובד (= מְכֻבָּד), ניגון (= נִגּוּן), היזק (= הֶזֵּק), etc. Similarly the א is used to represent also Pathaḥ, especially in the ending ַי-, probably in order to distinguish it from the ordinary ending ַי-; cf. בנאי (= בַּנַּי) זכאי (= זַכַּי), רשאי (= רַשַּׁי), שמאי (= שַׁמַּי). In modern Hebrew the א is generally employed to indicate Pathaḥ in loan words, e. g. פאסיבי, באנאלי, etc. On the manner of the development of the vowel-letters and the extent to which they are used in the Bible and other early records of Hebrew see Stade 34ff. and Ges.-K. 36ff. (including the bibliography on p. 39). Cf. also Kahle in Bauer-Leander § 7a.

49 The ל in לאמור is invariably pointed with Dagesh forte when preceded by משה with a conjunctive accent, although the tone of לאמר is on the ultima, e. g. Ex 6:10.29, 15:24, etc. For a discussion and an explanation of the Dagesh in this instance see Pinsker, *Mabo* 60–62.

50 Ḥayyuj (N. 8f.) calls attention to the irregularity of this form. He is also quoted by Ibn Ezra (Ṣ. 38b) to the effect that the Ḳameṣ under the ב is calculated to differentiate this word in meaning from בָּתִּים Ez 45:14. According to Wright (*Comp. Grammar*, p. 88) בָּתִּים is for בַּיְתִים, in which, however, the *ǎ* sound of the diphthong predominated and yielded *ā* instead of *ay*, on the analogy of אָן, אָנָה, מֵאָן from אַיִן; cf. also below, notes 376 and 598. The Dagesh in the ת is, therefore, Dagesh lene. A somewhat similar explanation is offered by Parḥon (op. cit., p. 4b f.), but the Dagesh in the ת is regarded by him as Dagesh forte, compensating for the rejected Yod. Cf. also Pinsker, *Mabo*, p. 72f.; Ges.-K. § 96; and below, note 514.

51 This is discussed at length by Ben Asher in *Diḳ*. 28ff. He arranges these letters in the order of אויה, while later grammarians, after the example of Menaḥem (*Maḥ*. 5b), adopted the order of יֵהוּא (with reference to Jehu the king of Israel) for mnemonic reasons. Ben Asher employs the terms מַפִּיק, מַפְסִיק, וּדְאָתֵי מֵרָחִיק, without making any reference to other sources. It is, however, certain, according to Bacher, *Anf.* 31, that these terms did not originate with Ben Asher. In the category of וּדְאָתֵי מֵרָחִיק Ben Asher includes what later grammarians refer to by דְּחִיק. Saadia lays down this general rule (quoted by Bacher, loc. cit. 46): When a word ends in one of the seven vowels (see above, n. 11), except Pathaḥ, the initial letter (of the בגד כפת group) of the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

following word is rāfe. This, Saadia maintains, is borne out not only in biblical texts but also in popular parlance, in the everyday conversation of women, and he adduces some notable examples of Aramaic speech, the language then in vogue among the people. To this rule Saadia gives the following exceptions: (1) when the preceding word ends in Pathaḥ, e. g. מַה־בֶּצַע; (2) when the word begins with two בs, e. g. וַיְהִי בְּבוֹאָם; (3) when it begins with two כs, e. g. הֲלֹא כְּכַרְכְּמִישׁ; (4) when it begins with the combination בפ, e. g. שָׂמְתִּי בְּפִיךָ; (5) in all cases of וַיְהִי כִּשְׁמֹעַ. The last example is not corroborated by our masoretic text.

[52] According to Pinsker (loc. cit. 110) the Dagesh in the ק of קערותיו and in the צ of צאו was intended by the earlier teachers to call the attention of the pupils to the peculiarities of these forms. In the former instance קְעָרֹתָיו is unusual for קַעֲרֹתָיו, while in the latter the sound of Ḥatef Ḳameṣ under the צ (cf. ibid. 72 and above § 4b) among the three Shureḳ vowels had to be emphasized. This is in conformity with his idea that the Dagesh is a diacritical point, which was invented by the early Hebrew teachers to point out, before the vowel systems were established, certain phonetic peculiarities (ibid. 7 and 70f.). On this principle Pinsker explains plausibly many of the so-called anomalous cases of euphonic Dagesh or Dagesh dirimens. Cf. also Ges.-K. § 20f-i.

[53] Cf. Ben Asher, *Diḳ*. 30: וכל שתי אותיות שוות וקדמאה שוא, לעולם דגש, כמו ויהי בְּבואה (שופטים א, י"ד) . . . וכל בי"ת פ"ה נידון כבי"ת בי"ת לפי שהן ממוצא השפה, כמו ואכבדה בְּפרעה (שמות י"ד, ד) ושאר כל המקרא כאשר תִּקְסֹךְ אוי"ה לבנד כפ"ת, יהי רפי. "In all cases of two identical letters, the first takes Dagesh when vocalized with Shewa, e. g. ויהי בְּבוֹאָה. The combination of בפ is always regarded as בב, because both (ב and פ) are labials, e. g. ואכבדה בְּפרעה. In all other biblical instances the letters בנד כפ"ת immediately preceded by אוי"ה are rāfe."

[54] In our text the second כ in both instances has Dagesh. But Ben Asher (ibid. 29), likewise, reads them without Dagesh in this כ.

[55] All these exceptional examples are quoted by Ben Asher (ibid.). But see Koenig's attempt to explain them away, *Lgb.* I, 63.

[56] But see above § 5b and below, where Ḳimḥi distinctly ascribes the characteristic of a twofold pronunciation to all other consonants besides בגד כפת. The difference between the two categories of consonants seems to consist, according to him, in that the בגד כפת letters, unlike the others, are pronounced hard only when they have Dagesh. This fine quibble may again bear testimony to the persistence of the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ancient masoretic tradition with regard to the twofold pronunciation and designation of all the letters, except the laryngeals and the ר (cf. above, note 37). The masoretic tradition of Ben Asher's text, which has become by the authority of Maimonides (*Mishneh Torah*, Hilkhoth Sefer Torah, Chap. 8) our Textus Receptus, had apparently well established itself in Ḳimḥi's days, but not to the extent of supplanting all vestiges of the earlier tradition.

[57] This masorete is identified by Dukes (*Ḳontres ha-Masoreth*, p. 2) with Judah ben 'Alan, mentioned by the anonymous author of the Hebrew Grammar published by Poznański, p. 21, and by the Ḳaraitic authors Judah Hadassi (*Eshkol ha-Kofer*, pp. 98b and 69a) and Levi ben Yefeth (cf. Pinsker, *Liḳ.*, Addenda, p. 64). The latter describes him as the head of the Jerusalem Yeshiva. The same opinion is held by Geiger (*Oṣar Neḥmad* II, p. 158) and is corroborated by Pinsker (op. cit. 105f.) and by Poznański (Anonymous Hebrew Grammar, note 86).

[58] This rule is quoted from Ben Asher (loc. cit., p. 7f.). Ḳimḥi cites in the Hebrew text (ed. Lyk, 57a) the following examples of ר with Dagesh: 1S 1:6, 10:24, 17:25, 2K 6:32, Ez 16:4, Pr 14:10, Cn 5:2, and in every initial ר in a monosyllabic word preceded by a word with the tone on the penultima. Elias Levita, in his gloss to this place, remarks: מצאתי במסורת ישנה כי ז׳ רישין דגושין והם אלו שׂוכר זולת מלות זעירות. Ḳimḥi mentions also (loc. cit.), after the Masora, four instances of א with Dagesh: Lv 23:17, Gn 43:26, Jb 33:21 and Ezr 8:18. All these instances, with the exception of the ר in Cn 5:2 and of the א in Gn 43:26, are mentioned also by Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik.* 10). Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 144) does not include רֻאּוּ Jb 33:21 in this category, because of its being in the Pu'al conjugation, in which case the א is entitled to Dagesh. Cf. on this Kirchheim's note ad h. l. Ibn Ezra (*Ṣ.* 24a) mentions only the instances of א with Dagesh in Lv 23:17 and Jb 33:21, but also that of תִּתְרָאּוּ. Gn 42:1. The question of ר with Dagesh is dismissed by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 7) merely with the remark that the Tiberians, the most puristic of all the Hebrews, have special rules with regard to the ר, which are mentioned in the book of phonetics, entitled in Arabic Kitāb al-Muṣawwatāh. Cf. also the anonymous Hebrew Grammar, ed. Poznański, p. 10 and note 29; also Bauer-Leander 126f.

[59] The interchange of the א and ה, and of the Waw and Yod, was already observed by Ben Asher (loc. cit. 8f.) and by Menaḥem (*Maḥ.* 37b and 70a). The latter speaks also of many nouns in which letters are missing, added, and interchanged, as the case may be, after which

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

follow the examples: ראם, רים, רום Ps 12:9; תוא, תאו; באר, בור, ביר; etc. (ibid.. 78b), in which the interchange of אוי is implied. But even Saadia had this principle in mind when he interpreted נִתְּלַה Gn 47:13 in the meaning of נִתְּלְאָה and compares it to וַתֵּלֶא Jb 4:5 (cf. also comm. to Is 63:3, p. 142). Cf. also Ibn Koreish (*Ris.* 8 and 57) and David b. Abraham (Neubauer, *Notice* etc. 38 and 91). Dunash (see references in Bacher's *Anf.* p. 100, note 8) refers to the interchange of the יהוא letters in numerous cases. This subject is treated elaborately by Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* chapter 7 and *Opusc.* 291f.) and by Ibn Ezra (*Moz.* 15a–16b and in many other places quoted by Bacher in *Ibn Ezra* etc., p. 69, note 2). This treatment of אהוי by Ḳimḥi is taken in the main from Ḥayyuj (N. 10ff.). Cf. also Skoss in *JQR*, N. S., XXIII, 1ff.

[60] This is, of course, in consonance with Ḥayyuj's idea adopted by Ḳimḥi relative to the latent quiescents (אוי) being respectively entailed by the long vowels (see above, note 11). The Yod, the characteristic quiescent latent in the Ḥireḳ, and the Ṣere, is thus replaced here by א, according to Ḳimḥi.

[60a] Other examples quoted by Ḳimḥi in the Hebrew text are: שָׁפְכָה Dt 21:7 and נוֹשְׁבָה Jr 22:6. In these examples, as well as in שֻׁפְּכָה Ps 73:2, are probably to be noted the remains of the feminine plural, with the suffix ־ָה; cf. Aram. נְפַקָה Dn 5:5, etc. The Naḳdanim having misunderstood the etymology of this unusual form in Hebrew, vocalized it like the masc. plur.

[61] The Yod is here in place of א, according to Ḥayyuj (N. 11), in order to indicate the plural or dual characteristic of these forms. But in point of fact the Yod in these instances is really a radical (cf. below, note 614).

[61a] This is, of course, an antiquated etymology. The fact is that the Waw in all the three instances is the original radical. Cf. below, notes 64 and 301.

[62] Also in the first person plural: שָׁמַרְנוּ, etc. A better and more inclusive rule would be the following: In verbs with open suffixes the tone is on the second radical if it has a vowel, and only the closed suffixes תֶם–ן attract the tone. This applies also to the Imperfect tenses. Generally, in both nouns and verbs with open suffixes such as –ִנִי, –נוּ, –הוּ, –ֵיךָ, –וּךָ, etc., the tone is on the penultima; while the closed suffixes –ֵם–ן, כֶם–ן, הֶם–ן, invariably take the tone. These rules represent, of course, only our masoretic accentuation and have no reference to the principles of accentuation governing the Semitic languages. Originally the system of accentuation in the Semitic languages was rather free

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

and was independent of the position or number of the syllables in the word. Cf. Bauer-Leander 176ff. A thoroughgoing discussion on Hebrew accents is found in E. Hommel's *Lautlehre*.

[63] Ḳimḥi really uses here the expression מלה שהיא מלעיל, but, as Levita comments ad l., this rule applies only to cases where the tone is on the first syllable.

[64] Nouns of the קְטָל formations in ל״ה verbs will necessarily evolve into forms like תֹּהוּ, בֹּהוּ, or דֳּמִי, חֳלִי, etc.; cf. below, notes 444. Ḳimḥi, as will be shown later, still operates largely with the principle that nouns of the weak stems constitute categories different from those of the strong verbs; cf. below, note 507.

[65] References to Ibn Ezra relative to the effect of the Waw Consecutive on the accent are found in Bacher's *Ibn Esra* etc. 67, note 2.

[66] Other instances in which the tone is unaffected by the Waw Consecutive are: (a) in the first person plural of the Perfect, e. g. וְהָלַכְנוּ, וְיָשַׁבְנוּ and (b) when the penultima to which the tone is to recede, is a closed syllable, e. g. וַיְדַבֵּר, וַיִּשְׁמֹר, etc.

[67] Cf. references to Ibn Ezra in Bacher's *Ibn Esra* etc. 67, note 3. The last two examples אֶחָד and אַחֵר are not segolates but belong to the intensive formations, cf. below § 48b c and notes 423 and 426.

[68] The preference in Hebrew for the Segol-Ḳameṣ series is not restricted to cases with laryngeals; cf. מֶמְשָׁלָה, מֶרְכָּבָה, מֶבָּטָהּ Zc 9:5 (but מֶבָּטָם and מֶבָּטֵנוּ Is 20:5 and 6); also the traditional pronunciation of מֶרְחָץ, מֶרְכָּז, תּוֹסֶפְתָּא, מֶשְׁכַּבְתָּא, and, in some localities, מֶדְרָשׁ (for מִדְרָשׁ). Cf. also Syriac *Kenfâ* (wing) for *Kanfā* (from *kanafa*). See also note 184.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

CHAPTER II. THE PRONOUN

§ 10. The Personal Pronoun

	Singular		Plural	
a	1. Com. אָנֹכִי, in pause אָנֹֽכִי אֲנִי, in pause אָֽנִי.	I	1. Com. אֲנַחְנוּ [in pause אֲנָֽחְנוּ], נַחְנוּ,[69a] [in pause נָֽחְנוּ] אֲנוּ[b]	'
	2. m. אַתָּה, in pause אָֽתָּה also אַתָּ f. אַתְּ[a] [69]	thou	2. m. אַתֶּם f. אַתֵּן[c], אַתֵּנָה [אַתֶּן]	ye
	3. m. הוּא he (it) f. הִיא she (it)		3. m. הֵם[d] (הֶם־) הֵמָּה f. הֵנָּה, after prefixes הֵן, הֶן[e]	th

b *a*].* This feminine pronoun is also used as a masculine in three places: Nu 11:15, Dt 5:24, Ez 28:14.

c *b*]. This form is found in the Kethib in Jr 42:6 and is more common in the Mishna.[70]

d *c*]. This is the form found in Ez 34:31,[71] while אַתֵּנָה occurs in Gn 31:6 [also, in our text, in Ez 13:11.20 and 34:17].

e *d*]. When affixed to verbs, nouns and particles, this form is reduced to ם, or it occurs with Segol under the ה [e. g. פְּקָדָם, פּוֹקְדֵיהֶם or פּוֹקְדָם, דְּבָרָם or דִּבְרֵיהֶם]; it is also found detached and with Ṣere in עַד־הֵם 2K 9:18 [Ges.-K. § 32n suggests the reading עָדֵיהֶם (cf. Jb 32:12)].

*[All such notes as are placed in a bracket are the author's comments on the respective forms in the paradigm tables].

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

f *e*]. These masculine and feminine pronouns sometimes interchange, thus הֲלָהֵן Ru 1:13, הֵנָּה 2S 4:6 and Jr 50:5 in the masculine, whilst הֵמָּה Cn 6:8 is in the feminine meaning. With the prefixes כ and ל the Ṣere changes to Segol (but in Aramaic לָהֵן), but of the 18 instances of בָּהֵן found in the Bible, 15 occur with Ṣere and 3 with Segol. In הם the Ṣere is always retained with the prefixes הוכש (except כָּהֵם 2K 17:15), but with בלם it changes to Segol in most instances.

§ 11. The Demonstrative Pronoun

a. Sing. { m. זֶה or זוּ[72]; f. זאת, also זה and זוּ[a] }

Plural אֵל or אֵלֶּה.

b. *Rem.* 1. The prepositions prefixed to the demonstrative pronoun take either Ḳameṣ or Shewa,[73] e. g. בָּזֶה 1S 14:34, כָּזֹה וְכָזֶה 2S 11:25, לָזֹאת Jr 5:7, כְּזֹאת Gn 45:23, לְזֹאת ibid 2:23; לָאֵלֶּה Nu 26:53, כָּאֵלֶּה Lv 10:19, also בְּאֵלֶּה 2Chr 18:10 and כְּאֵלֶּה Jr 10:16.

c. *Rem.* 2. Another class of demonstrative pronouns is לַזֶּה for masculine, לַז, for masculine and feminine,[74] and לַזוּ for feminine [in our text: הַלָּזֶה, הַלָּז and הַלָּזוּ].

a. The form זוּ occurs only in Hos 7:16 (where it may be taken either as masculine or as feminine) and in Ps 132:12.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

§ 12. The Article

a. The article is expressed in Hebrew by ה prefixed to the substantive which it defines.[75] It is usually vocalized with Pathaḥ and is followed by Dagesh,[a] e. g. הַמֶּלֶךְ, הַדָּבָר, etc.

b. When the initial letter is a laryngeal (except ח, ה) or ר, the Pathaḥ of the article changes to Ḳameṣ, to compensate for the Dagesh, e. g. הָאָבִיב Ex 13:4, הָעֶרֶב Ezr 9:5, הָרוֹדִים 1K 5:30. Before ה and ח, also, less frequently, ע, the Pathaḥ remains unchanged, e. g. הַהִין Nu 28:7, הַחֵמָר Gn 11:3, הַעִוְרִים 2S 5:6[77] (but also הֶחָי Gn 6:19, הֶחַמָּנִים Is 17:8, הֶחֲרִיטִים ibid 3:22).[78] However, in a monosyllable, the Pathaḥ changes to Ḳameṣ before ה with Ḳameṣ and to Segol before ח with Ḳameṣ, e. g. הָהָר, but הֶחָי Lv 16:20. Before the laryngeals החע with Ḳameṣ, the article sometimes takes Segol, e. g. הֶחָדֶרָה Ju 15:1, הֶחָיִל Jos 6:2, הֶעָרֹב Ex 8:17, הֶהָרוּס 1K 18:30.

c. After the prefixes ב, כ, ל, the article is regularly elided, and its vowel is shifted back under the prefix, e. g. בַּהֶבֶל . . . בַּחֹשֶׁךְ Ec 6:4, בָּאָרוֹן Gn 50:26, לַעֵינַיִם 1S 16:7, also לָעֵינַיִם Gn 3:6, כַּיּוֹם ibid 25:33 (but also בְּהַשָּׁמַיִם Ps 36:6, לְהַגְּדוּד 2 Chr 25:10, כְּהַיּוֹם Gn 39:11, etc.) [*Riḳ.* 159].

a. This Dagesh is frequently omitted in מ, also in other letters with Shewa, in which case the Pathaḥ of the article is accompanied by Ga'ya, e. g. הַמְתָעֲבִים Mi 3:9, הַמְעֻשָּׁקָה Is 23:12, בַּסְעָרָה 2K 2:1 [in our text the ס has Dagesh), בַּשְּׂאֵת Lv 13:10, etc. Similarly the Dagesh is always omitted in the צ and the ל of הַצְפַרְדְּעִים and הַלְוִיִּם. In the case of Yod with Shewa, the Dagesh is retained only when the second radical is a laryngeal, but in הַיְאוֹר, בַּיְאוֹר, הַיְאוֹרִים, כַּיְעֵנִים La 4:3 the Yod is rāfe, while in כָּאוֹר Am 8:8 the Yod is suppressed and compensated by the long Ḳameṣ preceding it.[76]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

§ 13. The Interrogative Pronoun

The interrogative pronouns מִי and מָה[a] do not take either plural or pronominal suffixes. The Ḳameṣ in מָה changes to Pathaḥ before a Maḳḳef or הוּא and הִיא. Before חָ and עָ, מה has Segol, with the exception of seven instances, five with Ḳameṣ [four of which are before ע] and two with Pathaḥ [before ח], e. g. Gn 31:32, 2K 8:13, Ma 2:14, Ezr 6:9, Dn 4:32, Gn 31:36, Jb 21:21. [On מה in combination with the prepositional prefixes ב, כ and ל see below § 75h].

§ 14. The Relative Pronoun

The relative pronoun is אֲשֶׁר, or the prefix שֶׁ,[79] e. g. שֶׁשְּׁזָפַתְנִי Cn 1:6, שֶׁאָהֲבָה ibid 3:3, שֶׁכֻּבָּה ibid 5:9, שֶׁתֶּחְפָּץ ibid 3:5. This Segol (Pathaḥ ḳaṭan) is changed to Pathaḥ in Ju 5:7, Cn 1:7, Jb 19:29; to Ḳameṣ in Ju 6:17 (before א); and to Shewa in Ec 2:22 and 3:18 . This pronoun occurs also with the suffix ל in Ec 8:17, and with pronominal suffixes and interrogative pronouns, e. g. בְּשֶׁלִּי and בְּשֶׁלְּמִי Jona 1:7 and 12. This developed into the mishnic possessive preposition שֶׁל.

a. In twenty-seven places מה has Segol according to the Masora.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOTES: CHAPTER TWO

[69] On the origin and the development of this form see Pinsker, *Mabo* 90f. and Ges.-K. § 32h. The original feminine form אַתְּי (=אַנְתְּי), as in Arabic, Syriac, and Ethiopic, is found seven times as Kethib (Ju 17:2, 1K 14:2, 2K 4:16.23, 8:1, Jr 4:30, Ez 36:13). In the corresponding personal endings of the verb it occurs in this form orthographically in numerous instances (לִמַּדְתְּי Jr 2:33, קָרָאתי ibid 3:4, שָׁמַעְתְּי 4:19, זָכַרְתְּי Ez 16:43, וְיָרַדְתְּי Ru 3:3, וְשָׁכַבְתְּי ibid 4, etc.) and regularly before the pronominal suffixes, e. g. הִכְרַעְתִּנִי Ju 11:35, יְלִדְתִּנִי Jr 15:10, etc. (cf. below, note 174).

[70] This reading is accepted by most of the modern grammarians (cf. Ew. § 184a, St. § 179b, Bauer-Leander 248); but Ges.-K. § 32d reads אָנוּ. According to Noeldeke, *ZDMG*, 1884, 420, אָנוּ was newly coined after the model of אֲנִי. This form must have escaped the observation of Ibn Bal'am, for he distinctly states that the plural of אֲנִי is אֲנַחְנוּ and that אָנוּ is not found except in the Mishna (ולשון המדבר יחיד אֲנִי ולא נמצא לרבים אָנוּ כי מקומו אנחנו ורבותינו ז"ל יצרפוהו); cf. Kokowzoff's *Noviye Materiali*, [Text] 114.

[71] So in most Mss.; others have Segol under the ת, probably on the analogy of אַתֶּם and of the suffixes of the verbs in conjugation (שְׁמַרְתֶּם, שְׁמַרְתֶּן). The latter is the reading generally adopted in modern Hebrew; whilst the former corresponds perhaps more closely to the assumed ground-form for the fem. plur., *'antinnā*.

[72] The form זוּ occurs only in poetic style and mostly in the sense of a relative rather than a demonstrative pronoun; it is, therefore, not affected by gender or number. Koenig I, 135 mentions מִן־הַדּוֹר זוּ לְעוֹלָם Ps 12:8 as the only instance of the use of זוּ as a demonstrative, but even there it may be interpreted as a relative for אֲשֶׁר (cf. Ges.-K. § 126y). Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 128) regards the instance in Ḥab 1:11 as the only one where זוּ is definitely employed as a demonstrative, but see Ges.-K. § 138h.

[73] Cf. *Riḳ*. 167, where Ibn Janaḥ regards the instances with Shewa under the prefixes as irregular and "lightened" forms.

[74] It occurs once in the feminine in הַשּׁוּנַמִּית הַלָּז 2K 4:25, otherwise always in the masculine.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[75] The origin of the Hebrew article has been a widely disputed subject among the modern grammarians (cf. Koenig I, 132f.), the majority of them inclining to trace it back to an original form *hal*, cf. the Arabic article *al* (pronounced by some modern Beduins *hal*, see Wallin, *ZDMG*, VI, 195). Stade § 172a rejects this view and connects the Hebrew article etymologically with the Aram. termination of the status emphaticus *ā*. The latter has recently become the prevailing opinion among the grammarians, thanks to the elaborate and cogent arguments of Barth (*AJSL*, 1896, 7ff.). This article is, accordingly, etymologically related to the original Semitic demonstrative *hā*, cf. Arab. *hāḏā*, Aram. *hāden*, Syriac *hā-nā*. The sharpening of the following consonant is analogous to that of the consonants following the ו consecutive (cf. below § 21h).

[76] So Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Saadia* 54), Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 186) and Ibn Ezra ad l. Cf. also Ges.-K. § 19k[2]. On such contractions see above, note 50.

[77] Cf. the masoretic note: כל סמייא פקחין וכל יהודיי קמצין (i. e. all cases of הַעִוְרִים are with Pathaḥ under the article, of הָעִבְרִים—with Ḳameṣ).

[78] These three instances are recorded by Ben Asher, *Diḳ*. § 48. Saadia (ed. Harkavy, 64) mentions also וְהָחַלּוֹנִים Ez 41:16 (in our text וְהַחַלּוֹנִים).

[79] Modern scholars have been casting about for an explanation of the origin of this relative particle. Several solutions have been offered, yet no universal understanding has been reached. Some grammarians have sought to identify this particle with the prefixed relative ש and to trace them both to a common origin. This original form is של according to Ew. § 181b (8th ed. ,1870) and to Boettcher II, 81, the א being prosthetic and the ל hardened to ר in אשר; cf. Arabic *allaḏi*. This view is also favored by Wright (*Comp. Grammar* 118f.), who prefers to "seek the origin of the relative pronoun somewhere in the region of the demonstratives" and can point to the analogy of the interchange of ל and ר, "even in this region," in the case of the Syriac *hārka* (here) and the Chaldee הָלְכָא. Others assume an original ש, Ass. *sha*, which gave rise to the Phoenician אש (pronounced *asse, esse*) and to the Hebrew אֲשֶׁר by prefixing a prosthetic or pronominal א and by affixing, in Hebrew, a ר, this ר being in place of the original demonstrative root ל found in such forms as הַלָּזֶה, הַלָּז, *allaḏi* (cf. Koenig II, 323f.; Baumann, *Hebr. Relativsätze*, 1894, 44; Philippi, *Status Constructus in Hebr.*, 1871, 72ff.). An entirely different view is held by another group of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

philologists, according to which there is no relationship between ש and אשר, the latter being originally a substantive and the Hebrew representative of the Aramaic אֲתַר (place) and the Arabic *athar* (track, trace, footstep). This substantive was also used as a relative particle of place "where" and even in the sense of "which," analogies of which development in usage can be found in other languages (so Fleischer, Muelau, Sayce, Sperling, and others; cf. the discussion by Wright, op. cit. and by Koenig I, 140). The latter view was rejected by Noeldeke, *ZDMG*, XL, 738; but is supported by Brock. *GvG.* § 109g and β, and, in an exhaustive study, by Carl Gaenssle, *The Hebrew Particle* אֲשֶׁר, University of Chicago Press, 1915. The former etymology is defended by Eitan, *AJSL*, XLIV, 179ff.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

CHAPTER III. THE VERB

A. The Pure Stem or Ḳal

§ 15. General View

a. The verb is inflected in eight various ways. The first of these is called Ḳal (light),[80] because it has no formative additions and is therefore the ground-form for all the verbs. The Ḳal admits of additions for persons only (first, second and third), while the additions in the other conjugations are formative and serve to designate the particular conjugation.

b. The ground-form of any verb consists of three radicals (stem consonants) and is modeled after פָּעַל.[81] The long vowel under the פ (the first radical) is not a principal vowel, but is employed for the sake of euphony, for Hebrew does not usually tolerate two sounded consonants in succession without either a long vowel in the first or a Dagesh [or a silent Shewa] in the second consonant; but the Ḳal, as its name indicates, is a light conjugation and does not allow of internal modifications, such as Dagesh, etc. [cf. above and note 80]. The fact that this Ḳameṣ under the initial radical changes to Shewa in the Imperfect,[82] אֶפְעַל, יִפְעַל, may be adduced in proof of its being a non-essential vowel.

c. There are also verbs which deviate from this paradigm, in which one of the radicals either becomes quiescent or disappears by assimilation. These verbs will be discussed later. [Cf. below, D].

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

§ 16. Ground Forms: The Perfect [cf. above, note 82] Ḳal

a. The ground-form, the third singular masculine of the perfect Ḳal appears in three forms:

(a) פָּעַל, with Pathaḥ in the second radical, e. g. שָׁמַר Gn 37:11, זָכַר ibid 40:23. In pause this Pathaḥ changes to Ḳameṣ, in both singular and plural, e. g. אָמָר Gn 21:1, שָׁמָרוּ Nu 9:23, נָתָנּוּ Ez 27:19.[a]

b. *Rem.* 1. The Pathaḥ in pause in קָמַל Is 33:9 is in place of Ṣere, according to Jacob ben El'azar,[83] in his book Sefer ha-Shalem, as evidenced by קָמֵלּוֹ Is 19:6.[a] Ibn Janaḥ [*Riḳ.* 41] claims to have originated this rule, namely, that the Pathaḥ in pause, whether in nouns or in verbs, is always indicative of Ṣere in the non-pausal form [cf. numerous other instances corroborating this rule mentioned by Koenig II, 377f. and Ges.-K. § 29g].

c. *Rem.* 2. The following פָּעַל verbs have Ḳameṣ in the second radical in the Perfect, although they are not in pause: שָׁפָט 1S 7:17, שָׁאָג Amos 3:8, מָלָךְ Ps 93:1, ibid 97:1, ibid 99:1, וְכָעָס ibid 112:10, טָרָף Hos 6:1, זָמָם La 2:17, גָזָל Lv 5:23, עָמָד Jos 10:13, יָעָץ Is 14:27. Ibn Janaḥ [*Riḳ.* 198] mentions also דָבָק 1K 11:2, although the majority of authentic Mss. do not bear out this reading.

d. *Rem.* 3. The adjective of this formation is with Ḳameṣ in both syllables, e. g. חָכָם, רָשָׁע, סָכָל, טָרָף Gn 8:11.

a. The Dagesh in the Nun of נָתָנּוּ and in the Lamed of קָמֵלּוֹ is euphonic,[84] as in נִשָּׁתָּה Is 41:17, without pause נָשְׁתָה Jr 51:30. This Dagesh is of common occurrence in Hebrew, either in pause as in חָדֵלּוּ Ju 5:7, יָהֵלּוּ Jr 9:4, וָיֵחֵלּוּ Jb 29:21, or in a letter pointed with Shewa, as מִקְּדָשׁ Ex 15:17, וָאֶכְּרֶהָ Hos 3:2, נִצְּרָה Ps 141:3, יִקְּהַת and עִקְּבֵי Gn 49:10.17, הַרְּעִימָהּ 1S 1:6, מִקְּרֵה Dt 23:11 (in the latter instance the מ may be a preposition for מִן, the Nun being assimilated into the ק [Cf. Ḥayyuj, N. 93]).

e. (b) פָּעֵל with Ṣere in the second syllable, e. g. חָפֵץ, חָמֵץ Ex 12:39, and in pause, also in the plural חָדֵ֫לּוּ Ju 5:7 and 1S 2:5 [on the Dagesh in the ל cf. above, rem. 1]. In לָחֶם Ju 5:8, the Segol is unique, for, whether it is a verb like חָפֵץ and חָמֵץ Ex 12:39, or an adjectival noun like חָפֵץ Ps 5:5 and חָמֵץ Dt 16:3, there ought to be a Ṣere in the second syllable.[85]

f. (c) פָּעֹל, with Ḥolem in the second syllable, e. g. יָכֹל Ex 40:35, יָגֹרְתָּ Dt 28:60. When the Ḥolem is pretonic it changes to Ḳameṣ ḥatuf, e. g. וְיָכָלְתָּ Ex 18:23. In pause the Ḥolem bears the tone and is retained, e. g. יָכֹ֫לוּ Ex 8:14, נָזֹלּוּ Is 63:19 [on the Dagesh in the ל cf. above, rem. 1]. The adjectives of this formation are: גָּדוֹל, קָטֹן, קָרֹב, etc.

g. The tone in all these three formations is milra [on the ultima]. It is, however, shifted to the penultima when followed by a tone-syllable [cf. above, note 63], e. g. אָבַד כָּלַח Job 30:2, וְשָׁאַל לוֹ Nu 27:21, וְקָרָא בוֹ Dt 17:19, קָרָא לָיְלָה Gn 1:5, etc. There are, however, some exceptions, e. g. בָּרָא אֵלֶּה Is 40:26, הָיָה גֶשֶׁם 1K 17:7, הָיָה לֶחֶם Jr 52:6 [in our text it is mil'el], הָיָה אִישׁ 2K 5:1 (milra in some Mss., mil'el in others). On the other hand, the tone is sometimes on the penultima even before a tone-less syllable, e. g. שָׂכַר עָלֵינוּ 2K 7:6 שָׁאַל הָאִישׁ Gn 43:7.

h. The tone is on the penultima in all conjugations in the sing. of the first and second persons. Under the influence of the Waw Consecutive [see below § 21 and note 100], the tone is generally shifted to the ultima, e. g. וְשָׁמַרְתָּ Dt 4:40, וְהִכִּיתָ Ex 17:6 [in our text וְהִכִּיתָ], וְהַעֲתַרְתִּי ibid 8:25. In verbs ל"א and ל"ה, however, the Waw Consecutive has no effect on the tone, e. g. וְנָשָׂאתִי Gn 18:26,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

וְעָשִׂיתָ Ex 30:1,[a] etc. Similarly, in the pausal form of the strong verbs, the tone is not affected by the Waw Consecutive and the second radical has a Ḳameṣ, e. g. אָכָלְתָּ Gn 3:11, וְשָׂבָעְתָּ Dt 8:10, etc. Some retain the Pathaḥ even in pause: זָקַנְתִּי Gn 27:2, יָדַעְתִּי Ps 35:15, עָבַרְתִּי Pr 24:30, צָדַקְתִּי Jb 34:5, הִגַּדְתִּי Ne 2:16 נִצַּלְנוּ Jr 7:10, etc. According to the Masora, all cases of שִׁבַּרְתָּ, שִׁבַּרְתִּי, דִּבַּרְתָּ, הִצַּלְתָּ, הִצַּלְתִּי retain the Pathaḥ in pause.

[As to other forms of the Ḳal see paradigms and notes].

§ 17. The Infinitive

a. There are three principal forms of the Infinitive, Ḳal: פְּעֹל, פְּעֹל and פְּעַל,[86] e. g. זָכוֹר Ex 20:8,[b] הָלוֹךְ וְגָדֵל Gn 26:13,[c] עֲנוֹשׁ Pr 17:26,[d] שְׁלַח Is 58:9 and שְׁכַב 2K 14:22.

b. Other forms of the Infinitive Ḳal are:[88]

(a) With feminine suffix ־ָה, in which case the first radical has Ḳameṣ ḥatuf or Ḳibbuṣ in the פְּעֹל and Ḥireḳ in the פְּעַל forms, e. g. וּלְדָבְקָה Dt 30:20, לְקָרְבָה Ex 36:2, לְרָחֳקָה Ez 8:6, לְחֻמְלָה Ez 16:5 (and inflected: כְּשָׁמְעָתוֹ Is 30:19, חֻמְצָתוֹ Hos 7:4), לְיִרְאָה Dt 28:58, לְרִבְעָה Lv 20:16. When the first, or the second, radical is a laryngeal, the Ḥireḳ changes to Pathaḥ, e. g. לְאַשְׁמָה Lv 5:26,

a. וְאָפִיתָ Lv 24:5 is unique. In וְחָצִיתָ Nu 31:27 the tone is milra according to Ben Naftali, and mil'el, with two Pashtas, according to Ben Asher. Similarly in וְעָשִׂיתָ Za 6:11, the tone is milra according to Ben Naftali [mil'el in our text].

b. These Infinitives may sometimes be construed as Imperatives [cf. below § 78a].

c. The form וְגָדֵל may also be taken as Infinitive of the פָּעֵל formation, like וּבָשֵׁל Ex 12:9.[87]

d. When connected to the following word by Maḳḳef the Ḥolem changes to Ḳameṣ ḥatuf, e. g. מְלָךְ־מֶלֶךְ Gn 36:31.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

לְאַהֲבָה Dt 30:6,[89] לְדַאֲוָה Jr 31:11 [in our text לְדַאֲבָה], לְרַאֲוָה Ez 28:17, etc.

c. (b) With suffixed Nun, e. g. בְּאָבְדַן Es 8:6,[90] הֲשִׁיבוֹתָ מֵחֲרוֹן אַפֶּךָ Ps 85:4 (אַפֶּךָ being the object of הֲשִׁיבוֹתָ and מֵחֲרוֹן in the Infinitive [after Ibn Ezra, comment. a. l.]).

d. (c) With interpolated Yod, e. g. לְדַרְיוֹשׁ Ezr 10:16 [*Riḳ*. 27]. This form, however, is unique.

§ 18. The Imperative

a. The ground form of the Imperative is either פְּעֹל or פְּעַל. In פְּעֹל the Ḥolem changes to Ḳameṣ ḥatuf before Maḳḳef, e. g. זְכָר־נָא Mi 6:5; in פְּעַל the Pathaḥ changes to Ḳameṣ in pause, שְׁכָב 1S 3:5.6 (sometimes even without pause as in סְעָד לִבְּךָ Ju 19:5 [but this really goes back to a פְּעֹל form, see Ges.-K. § 64b, also below, § 19a].

b. *Rem.* 1. The Imperative occurs frequently with the suffix ־ָה, in which case the first radical takes Ḳameṣ ḥatuf, e. g. זָכְרָה לִּי Ne 5:19, or tone-long Ḳameṣ, שָׁמְרָה Ps 86:2 [cf. above, note 22]. When the second radical is a laryngeal the Ḳameṣ changes to Ḥolem, e. g. זֹעֲמָה Nu 23:7.[91] In the פְּעַל forms, the first radical takes Ḥireḳ, e. g. שִׁכְבָה Gn 39:7.12, in pause יְרָשָׁה Dt 33:23, שְׁאָלָה Is 7:11, also וּסְעָדָה 1K 13:7; but also without pause: סְלָחָה . . . שְׁמָעָה Dan 9:19 and רְפָאָה Ps 41:5.

c. *Rem.* 2. Some of the פְּעֹל forms, under the influence of the suffix ־ָה, are inflected like פְּעַל and vice versa, e. g. מִכְרָה Gn 25:31, נִצְּרָה Ps 141:3,[92] אֶסְפָה Nu 11:16, עֶרְכָה Job 33:5, from מְכֹר, נְצֹר, אֱסֹף and עֲרוֹךְ; also קָרְבָה Ps 69:19 from קְרַב.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

d. In the plural masculine and singular feminine the first radical takes Ḥireḳ,[93] שִׁמְרוּ 2S 18:12, and, even with Ga'ya, מִשְׁכוּ Ex 12:21, לִקְחִי 1K 17:11; before a laryngeal, Pathaḥ, or Segol, e. g. רַחֲקוּ Ez 11:15, אֶחֱזוּ Can 2:15, וְאֶחֱזִי־בָהּ Ru 3:15, חֶשְׂפִּי Is 47:2. We also find Ḳameṣ ḥatuf instead of Ḥireḳ, e. g. מָשְׁכוּ Ez 32:20, מָלְכִי Ju 9:10, etc. In pause the second radical takes Ḥolem in the פְּעֹל and Ḳameṣ in the פְּעַל forms, e. g. גְּזֹרוּ 1K 3:26, עֲבֹרִי Is 23:2 and וּשְׁמָעוּ Is 48:14, also חֲרָבִי Is 44:27, וְצָעָקִי Jr 22:20, and קָסָמִי־ 1S 28:8 (for euphonic reasons). In the plural feminine the second radical takes either Ḥolem: סְפֹדְנָה . . . חֲגֹרְנָה Jr 49:3, or Pathaḥ: צְעַקְנָה ibid; also with the final ה omitted קְרֶאןָ Ru 1:20, קִרְאֶן Ex 2:20, שְׁמַעַן Gn 4:23 [<שְׁמַעְןָ]. The form רְגָזָה Is 32:11 may be either an Imper. (for רְגַזְנָה), or an Infinitive with suffix ־ָה as, in the case of פְּשֹׁטָה וְעֹרָה וַחֲגוֹרָה ibid,[94] while in חִרְדוּ שַׁאֲנַנּוֹת ibid, the masculine plural may refer to the people in the peaceful cities.

§ 19. The Imperfect[95]

a. The principal parts of the Imperfect are יִפְעֹל[a], or יִפְעַל.[b] [96] Some verbs occur in both forms, e. g. תִּפְעָל־בִּי Jb 35:6 (the Ḳameṣ ḥatuf is in place of Ḥolem because of

a. The Ḥolem in the middle radical changes to Ḳameṣ ḥatuf when connected by Maḳḳef to a tone-syllable, e. g. יִמְשָׁל־בָּם Is 19:4, יִקְבָּץ־אָוֶן Ps 41:7, יִתְמָךְ־דְּבָרַי Pr 4:4 (with Ga'ya in the ד); but יִגְבָּל־אֹתוֹ Jos 18:20. This Ḥolem is sometimes replaced by Shureḳ, the tone shifting forward to the ultima, e. g. תַּעֲבוּרִי Ru 2:8, יִשְׁפּוּטוּ Ex 18:26, תִּשְׁמוּרֵם Pr 14:3 [cf. below § 37g].

b. In pause the Pathaḥ changes to Ḳameṣ. There are, however, instances where the Pathaḥ is retained even in pause, while in others the Pathaḥ changes to Ḳameṣ even without pause, e. g. אַל תַּחֲרָשׁ

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Maḳḳef) and יִפְעַל אֶל Is 44:15, וַיִּשְׁבֹּת Jos 5:12 and תִּשְׁבַּת Ne 6:3, יִשֹּׁךְ Ec 10:11 and יִשָּׁךְ Pr 23:32. [Further instances are quoted by Ibn Janaḥ, *Riḳ*. 83f.]. When the third (occasionally also the second) radical is a laryngeal, the second syllable has Pathaḥ: יִשְׁלַח, יִשְׁמַע, יִגְבַּה, יִשְׁחַט (but אֶזְעַם Nu 23:8).

b. In pause the Ḥolem of the יִפְעֹל forms is retained in all the inflections and bears the tone, while the Pathaḥ of the יִפְעַל forms is changed to a tone-bearing Ḳameṣ, e. g. תִּשְׁמֹרוּ Dt 13:5, תִּלְבָּשִׁי Is 49:18, תִּשְׁכָּחִי ibid 54:4, יִלְבָּשׁוּ Ez 26:16. With suffixed Nun, however, the tone shifts forward to the ultima, e. g. תִּדְבָּקִין Ru 2:8.21, יִקְצֹרוּן ibid 2:9, תִּכְרֹתוּן Ex 34:13, יִשְׁכָּבוּן Jos 2:8; also without pause, יִשְׁאָלוּן Jos 4:6, תֶּאֱהָבוּן Ps 4:3.

c. In the Imperfect of יִפְעֹל, when the first radical is a laryngeal, the vowel under the preformative א is Segol [cf. below § 22, p. 69], while that under the other preformatives is Pathaḥ, e. g. אֶעֱמֹד, יַעֲמֹד, תַּעַמְדוּ (but וַתְּהֲלַךְ Ex 9:23 and תִּהֲלַךְ Ps 73:9). The א also sometimes takes Pathaḥ, e. g. וְאַהַרְגָה Gn 27:42, וְאַחְדְּלָה Jb 16:6, and וָאֲנוּשָׁה Ps 69:21.[a] In the Imperfect of יִפְעַל all the preformatives take Segol when the first radical is a laryngeal, e. g. יֶחְדַּל Dt 15:11, תֶּחְסַר ibid 8:9. We find, however, the Pathaḥ and the Segol of the preformatives interchanging, e. g. וַיֶּחֱשֹׂף Ps 29:9, וְנֶחְמְדֵהוּ [cf. לֹא תַחְמֹד Ex 20:17]

Ps 109:1 [in our text the ר has Ḳameṣ], וַיִּבְאַשׁ Ex 16:20, also אִם אֶצְדַּק Jb 9:20, לֹא יִגְאַל Ru 4:4, וַיִּקְרַם Ez 37:8 [in our text the last three instances have Pathaḥ].

a. The latter is for וָאֲנֻשָׁה [rather וָאָנוּשָׁה, cf. above, note 48, also below, note 196], in which case the Shureḳ is like that in יִשְׁפּוּטוּ Ex 18:26 and תַּעֲבוּרִי Ru 2:8 [see below § 37g].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Is 53:2, יֶהְדֹּף Pr 10:3, and יֶהְדְּפֻהוּ Jb 18:18; also וַתַּעְגְּבָה Ez 23:20 for וַתַּעְגַּב ibid 5 [in our text וַתַּעְגַּב].

d. The first radical, when a laryngeal [and followed by Shewa], takes either Pathah or Segol, but also Shewa, e. g. וַיַּחַלְמוּ Gn 40:5, וְנַעַבְדָה Ex 14:12,[a] וַיֶּאֶרְבוּ Ju 9:34, יֶחֶרְדוּ Hos 11:11; also יַחְסְרוּ Ez 4:17, יֶחֶזְקוּ Is 28:22, etc.

§ 20. Lengthening of the Imperfect [Cohortative]

a. An ā (ָה) is sometimes affixed to the first person singular and plural, (to denote exhortation or encouragement) e. g. אֶשְׁמְרָה Ps 39:2 וָאֶשְׁלְחָה Gn 32:6 . . . נַחְפְּשָׂה וְנַחְקֹרָה L 3:40.[97] A Ḥatef Ḳameṣ is sometimes taking the place of the Shewa under the second radical, e. g. אֶשְׁקֳטָה Is 18:4 אֶפְשֳׂעָה ibid 27:4 אֶשֳּׁקָה 1K 19:20, and in Pi'el וַאֲלַקֳטָה and אֲלַקֳטָה Ru 2:2.7.[98] Similarly, many instances of Imperfect of the יִפְעֹל formation, when occurring with pronominal suffixes, have Ḥatef Ḳameṣ instead of Shewa under the second radical, e. g. וְאֶסֳּרֵם Hos 10:10, יֶהְדֳּפֵם Jos 23:5, יִקֳּבֶנּוּ Is 62:2, etc. In pause the Ḥolem of the verbs of יִפְעֹל formations is retained, while in those of יִפְעַל the Pathaḥ under the second radical changes to Ḳameṣ, e. g. אֶעֱלֹזָה Hab 3:18, וְנִכְרָעָה Ps 95:6, נִקְרָבָה Is 41:1.

b. *Rem.* 1. ָה is sometimes changed to ֶה, e. g. וָאֶקְרָאֶה 1S 28:15, יְדַשְּׁנֶה Ps 20:4.[99] This change in vowels may be due to the similarity of this lengthened form to ל״ה verbs.

a. In תָעָבְדֵם Ex 20:5 and וְנָעָבְדֵם Dt 13:3 the Ḳameṣ under the ע is euphonic, which in turn influences the preceding vowel to become Ḳameṣ [cf., however, below, note 127; also Ges.-K. § 60b]. In a Jerusalem Ms. we find also אֶעֱבָדְךָ Gn 29:18 and אֶעֱזָבְךָ [probably אֶעֱזָבְךָ] ibid 28:15.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

c. *Rem.* 2. [The cohortative] ־ָה **occurs also** in the second and third persons, e. g. תְּעָפָה Jb 11:17, וַתַּעְגְּבָה Ez 23:16.20 [in our text וַתַּעְגְּבָה], תָּרֹנָּה Pr 1:20, יָחִישָׁה . . . וְתָבֹאָה Is 5:19.

§ 21. The Waw Consecutive[100] with the Perfect and Imperfect, and the Waw Copulative

a. The Waw Consecutive prefixed to a verb in the Perfect indicates action in the future, e. g. וְשָׁמַר Dt 7:12, etc. When preceded by a verb in the Perfect the Waw with Perfect has merely copulative force, e. g. פָּעַל וְעָשָׂה Is 41:4, אָכַל וְשָׁתָה וְעָשָׂה Jr 22:15.

b. *Rem.* 1. There is no difference in vocalization between the Waw Copulative and the Waw Consecutive with the Perfect. Both are vocalized as follows [cf. Ibn Janaḥ, *Riḳ.*, chap. 18]:

(a) Usually with simple Shewa (וְ).

c. (b) Before words beginning with a laryngeal the Waw takes the vowel with which the Shewa of the laryngeal is compounded, e. g. וַאֲכָלֻהוּ Jr 10:25, וֶהֱשִׁיבְךָ Dt 28:68, וָאֳנִיּוֹת Is 60:9. So also before a laryngeal with a simple Shewa, in which case a compound Shewa is implied, e. g. וַעְצֹר Jb 4:2 (for וַעֲצֹר), וֶחְיֵה Pr 4:4 (for וֶחֱיֵה).

d. (c) With Shureḳ before a consonant with Shewa, or before the letters בומף,[a] e. g. וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם Ex 12:24.25, וּמָלַךְ Jr 23:5; also with Ga'ya when followed by Ḥatef Pathaḥ,

a. This is due to euphonic reasons, for the Waw belongs together with these letters to the same category, designated as labials (but in בְּפָרֶךְ Ex 1:14 the ב retains the Shewa because of the Dagesh). This ו is pronounced traditionally, according to Ḥayyuj [N. 10], as if it were preceded by א (ū).[101]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

וְתְבֻקְשִׁי Ez 26:21, וְשֲׁבֵה Ju 5:12, וְשֲׁמַע Nu 23:18 [in our text וּשְׁמָע].

e. (d) Before a Yod with Shewa the Waw coalesces with this Yod resulting in וִי, e.g. וִיסַדְתִּיךְ Is 54:11, וִיהוּדָה 1S 18:16.

f. (e) With Ḳameṣ frequently before a tone-syllable [cf. above, note 63], e. g. וָשָׁב Is 6:10, וָקָם Pr 24:16, וָמֵתוּ Gn 33:13.[a]

g. *Rem.* 2. On the pointing of the Waw with אֲדֹנָי and אֱלֹהִים see below § 75e.

h. The Imperfect with the Waw consecutive has the converse function of that of the Perfect with this Waw and refers to action in the past, e. g. וַיֹּאמֶר Gn 12:1, etc. When the construction points to action in the sense of Imperfect the Waw is copulative and is differently vocalized. The Waw Consecutive takes Pathaḥ followed by Dagesh,[b] which Pathaḥ changes to Ḳameṣ before א,[c] e.g. וָאֲבָרֵךְ Gn 24:48, וָאֹמַר Ex 32:24, etc. The Waw copulative with the Imperfect shares the respective rules of punctuation governing the Waw copulative with the Perfect and the prefixes בכל [see below § 75b–e].

a. But when the Waw is appended to a word which is in close syntactical connection with the following word, it is pointed in accordance with the preceding rules, e. g. וְקָם Dt 31:16, וּמֵתוּ ibid 22:22.[102]

b. This Dagesh is omitted in Yod with Shewa, e. g. וַיְרַקְּעוּ Ex 39:3, וַיְחַבֵּר ibid 36:10, etc.; but in וַיְּחַיֶּהָ 2S 12:3 and וַיְּצַוֵּהוּ 1S 13:14, the Yod preformative has Dagesh according to Samuel ha-Nagid, which reading however, is not corroborated by available authentic Mss. The Waw in this case sometimes takes Ga'ya.

c. Exceptions: וַאֲמֹתְתֵהוּ 2S 1:10, וַאֲכַסֵּךְ Ez 16:10.[103]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Paradigms Strong Verbs

	Ķal			Nif'al	Pi'el
Perf. sing. 3m.	***קָטַל	כָּבֵד	קָטֹן	נִקְטַל	קִטֵּל קִטַּל
3f.	[a]*קָֽטְלָה	כָּֽבְדָה	קָטְנָה	נִקְטְלָה	קִטְּלָה
2m.	[b]קָטַלְתָּ	כָּבַדְתָּ	קָטַנְתָּ	נִקְטַלְתָּ	קִטַּלְתָּ
2f.	[c]קָטַלְתְּ	כָּבַדְתְּ	קָטַנְתְּ	נִקְטַלְתְּ	קִטַּלְתְּ
1c.	קָטַלְתִּי	כָּבַדְתִּי	קָטַנְתִּי	נִקְטַלְתִּי	קִטַּלְתִּי
plur. 3c.	[d]קָֽטְלוּ	כָּֽבְדוּ	קָֽטְנוּ	נִקְטְלוּ	קִטְּלוּ
2m.	[e]קְטַלְתֶּם	כְּבַדְתֶּם	קְטָנְתֶּם	נִקְטַלְתֶּם	קִטַּלְתֶּם
2f.	קְטַלְתֶּן	כְּבַדְתֶּן	קְטָנְתֶּן	נִקְטַלְתֶּן	קִטַּלְתֶּן
1c.	[f]קָטַלְנוּ	כָּבַדְנוּ	קָטַנּוּ	נִקְטַלְנוּ	קִטַּלְנוּ
Inf.	קְטֹל	שְׁכַב		הִקָּטֵל	קַטֵּל
Inf. absol.	קָטֹל			הִקָּטֹל נִקְטֹל	קַטֹּל קַטֵּל
Impf. sing. 2m.	קְטֹל	שְׁכַב		הִקָּטֵל	קַטֵּל
2f.	קִטְלִי	שִׁכְבִי		הִקָּטְלִי	קַטְּלִי
pl. 2m.	קִטְלוּ	שִׁכְבוּ		הִקָּטְלוּ	קַטְּלוּ
2f.	קְטַלְנָה	שְׁכַבְנָה		הִקָּטַלְנָה	קַטֵּלְנָה

* [On the meaning of these designations see above, p. 47, footnote].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Pu'al	Hif'il	Hof'al	Hithpa'el
קֻטַּל	הִקְטִיל	הָקְטַל	הִתְקַטֵּל
קֻטְּלָה	הִקְטִילָה	הָקְטְלָה	הִתְקַטְּלָה
קֻטַּלְתָּ	הִקְטַלְתָּ	הָקְטַלְתָּ	הִתְקַטַּלְתָּ
קֻטַּלְתְּ	הִקְטַלְתְּ	הָקְטַלְתְּ	הִתְקַטַּלְתְּ
קֻטַּלְתִּי	הִקְטַלְתִּי	הָקְטַלְתִּי	הִתְקַטַּלְתִּי
קֻטְּלוּ	הִקְטִילוּ	הָקְטְלוּ	הִתְקַטְּלוּ
קֻטַּלְתֶּם	הִקְטַלְתֶּם	הָקְטַלְתֶּם	הִתְקַטַּלְתֶּם
קֻטַּלְתֶּן	הִקְטַלְתֶּן	הָקְטַלְתֶּן	הִתְקַטַּלְתֶּן
קֻטַּלְנוּ	הִקְטַלְנוּ	הָקְטַלְנוּ	הִתְקַטַּלְנוּ
---	[הַקְטִיל]	---	הִתְקַטֵּל
קֻטֹּל	הַקְטֵל	הָקְטֵל	הִתְקַטֵּל
Wanting	הַקְטֵל	Wanting	הִתְקַטֵּל
	הַקְטִילִי		הִתְקַטְּלִי
	הַקְטִילוּ		הִתְקַטְּלוּ
	הַקְטֵלְנָה		הִתְקַטֵּלְנָה

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

		Ḳal			Nif'al	Pi'el
Impf. sing.	3m.	יִקְטֹל	יִכְבַּד	יִקְטַן	יִקָּטֵל	יְקַטֵּל
	3f.	תִּקְטֹל	תִּכְבַּד		תִּקָּטֵל	תְּקַטֵּל
	2m.	תִּקְטֹל	תִּכְבַּד		תִּקָּטֵל	תְּקַטֵּל
	2f.	תִּקְטְלִי	תִּכְבְּדִי[g]		תִּקָּטְלִי	תְּקַטְּלִי
	1c.	אֶקְטֹל[h]	אֶכְבַּד		אֶקָּטֵל	אֲקַטֵּל
plur.	3m.	יִקְטְלוּ	יִכְבְּדוּ		יִקָּטְלוּ	יְקַטְּלוּ
	3f.	תִּקְטֹלְנָה	תִּכְבַּדְנָה[i]		תִּקָּטַלְנָה	תְּקַטֵּלְנָה
	2m.	תִּקְטְלוּ	תִּכְבְּדוּ		תִּקָּטְלוּ	תְּקַטְּלוּ
	2f.	תִּקְטֹלְנָה	תִּכְבַּדְנָה[i]		תִּקָּטַלְנָה	תְּקַטֵּלְנָה
	1c.	נִקְטֹל	נִכְבַּד		נִקָּטֵל	נְקַטֵּל
Shortened Impf.						
Part. Active	m.s.	קֹטֵל[j]		קָטֹן	נִקְטָל	מְקַטֵּל
	f.s.	קֹטֶלֶת[k]			נִקְטֶלֶת / נִקְטָלָה	מְקַטֶּלֶת / מְקַטְּלָה
	m.p.	קֹטְלִים[l]			נִקְטָלִים	מְקַטְּלִים
	f.p.	קֹטְלוֹת			נִקְטָלוֹת	מְקַטְּלוֹת
Part. Passive	m.s.	קָטוּל[m]				מְקֻטָּל[o]
	f.s.	קְטוּלָה[n]				מְקֻטֶּלֶת / מְקֻטָּלָה
	m.p.	קְטוּלִים				מְקֻטָּלִים
	f.p.	קְטוּלוֹת				מְקֻטָּלוֹת

Pu'al	Hif'il	Hof'al	Hithpa'el
יְקֻטַּל	יַקְטִיל	יָקְטַל	יִתְקַטֵּל
תְּקֻטַּל	תַּקְטִיל	תָּקְטַל	תִּתְקַטֵּל
תְּקֻטַּל	תַּקְטִיל	תָּקְטַל	תִּתְקַטֵּל
תְּקֻטְּלִי	תַּקְטִילִי	תָּקְטְלִי	תִּתְקַטְּלִי
אֲקֻטַּל	אַקְטִיל	אָקְטַל	אֶתְקַטֵּל
יְקֻטְּלוּ	יַקְטִילוּ	יָקְטְלוּ	יִתְקַטְּלוּ
תְּקֻטַּלְנָה	תַּקְטֵלְנָה	תָּקְטַלְנָה	תִּתְקַטֵּלְנָה
תְּקֻטְּלוּ	תַּקְטִילוּ	תָּקְטְלוּ	תִּתְקַטְּלוּ
תְּקֻטַּלְנָה	תַּקְטֵלְנָה	תָּקְטַלְנָה	תִּתְקַטֵּלְנָה
נְקֻטַּל	נַקְטִיל	נָקְטַל	נִתְקַטֵּל
	יַקְטֵל		
part. [149]קֻטָּל	p.a. מַקְטִיל	part. [152]הָקְטָל	מִתְקַטֵּל
קֻטָּלָה	מַקְטֶלֶת	הָקְטֶלֶת	מִתְקַטֶּלֶת
	מַקְטִילָה	הָקְטָלָה	מִתְקַטְּלָה
קֻטָּלִים	מַקְטִילִים	הָקְטָלִים	מִתְקַטְּלִים
קֻטָּלוֹת	מַקְטִילוֹת	הָקְטָלוֹת	מִתְקַטְּלוֹת
	[152]מָקְטָל		
	מָקְטֶלֶת		
	מָקְטָלִים		
	מָקְטָלוֹת		

Digitized by Google | Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

§ 22. Notes on Ḳal

a. a].* In pause the middle radical retains the original vowel of its ground form, the Pathaḥ of פָּעַל changing to Ḳameṣ (cf. below, n. d]), e. g. נָתָנָה Ju 5:25, וְשָׂמֵחָה Es 8:15. A ת is sometimes employed instead of ה to denote third person feminine,[105] e. g. אָזְלַת Dt. 32:36, וְנֹכָחַת Gn 20:16, in ל״א verbs וְקָרָאת Dt 31 :29, with Ḳameṣ in the second syllable.

b. *Rem.* 1. In וְעָשָׂת Lv 25:21, with Ḳameṣ under the שׂ, according to most Mss. and Ben Naftali, the second Ḳameṣ is that of the ת of the usual וְעָשְׂתָה, which, upon the elimination of the quiescent ה, was shifted back under the שׂ [but see below, note 302]. In וְשָׁבַת Ez 46:17, the Ḳameṣ under the ב of the regular וְשָׁבָה was changed to Pathaḥ, because of its being in a syllable closed by the fem. characteristic ת instead of ה.

c. *Rem.* 2. The feminine afformative ה is sometimes changed to א, e. g. גָּבְהָא Ez 31:5 [cf. above § 7s].

d. b]. The latent ה is sometimes written after the afformative, e. g. נָתַתָּה Gn 3:12, מִגַּרְתָּה Ps 89:45, etc.

h. c]. When the third radical is a laryngeal it takes Pathaḥ in place of Shewa, e. g. וְלָקַחַתְּ 1K 14:3, יָגַעַתְּ Is 57:10, שָׁמַעַתְּ Ru 2:8 [cf. נַעְר<נַעַר, etc.].

i. d]. In pause the second radical retains its original vowel of the ground form, the Pathaḥ of the פָּעַל formation changing to Ḳameṣ, e. g. טָמָנוּ Ps 9:16, גָּבֵרוּ 2S 1:23, יָכֹלוּ Ex 8:14. This form occurs sometimes with suffixed Nun, יָדְעוּן Dt 8:3, צָקוּן Is 26:16.[106]

j. e]. The Pathaḥ under the second radical is sometimes changed to Ḥireḳ, e. g. וּפִשְׁתֶּם Mal 3:20 (for וּפַשְׁתֶּם),

* [On the meaning of these designations see above, p. 47, footnote].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

וִירִשְׁתֶּם Dt 11:23, or to Segol, שְׁאֶלְתֶּם Job 21:29. Jacob ben El'azar [cf. above, note 83] maintains that the פָּעַל formations always retain the Pathaḥ under the second radical with this afformative, but that וִירִשְׁתֶּם and שְׁאֶלְתֶּם are derived from יָרֵשׁ and שָׁאֵל, since Ṣere, Segol, and Ḥireḳ are kindred vowels and frequently interchange. The tone is always milra, even with Waw Consecutive; hence, the Ḳameṣ of the first radical is changed to Shewa.

k. f]. The tone is always on the penultima, even with the Waw Consecutive. In pause the Pathaḥ under the second radical changes to Ḳameṣ. In some cases the Pathaḥ is retained even in pause, e. g. נִצַּלְנוּ Jr 7:10, הֶחֱרַמְנוּ 1S 15:15.

l. g]. It occurs sometimes with Ḥatef Ḳameṣ for the sake of euphony, e. g. וַתִּשְׁחֳדִי Ez 16:33 [but it is probably to be traced back to תִּשְׁחֹד, cf. Ges.-K. § 64b].

m. h]. The reason for the Segol under the א, while the other preformatives have Ḥireḳ, is to avoid similarity in sound with the Yod of the third person sing. m., יִפְעַל.[107]

n. i]. In pause the Pathaḥ changes to Ḳameṣ, but it is retained in numerous instances, e. g. תִּשְׁפַּלְנָה Is 5:15, תִּצַּתְנָה Jr 49:2, etc. The form וַתִּגְבְּהֶינָה Ez 16:50 (on the analogy of וּתְבוֹאֶינָה Jr 9:16) is unusual for וַתִּגְבַּהְנָה [cf. Ḥayyuj, N. 42 and *Riḳ.* 27]. The afformative ה is sometimes omitted, e. g. תִּלְבַּשְׁןָ 2S 13:18, וַתַּהֲרֶיןָ Gn 19:36. We also find a preformative Yod and afformative נָה occurring together, e. g. וַיִּשַּׁרְנָה 1S 6:12, וַיֵּחַמְנָה Gn 30:38, יַעֲמֹדְנָה Dan 8:22. [Cf. below, note 230].

o. j]. Before a laryngeal [except א] the Ṣere is either followed by a furtive Pathaḥ, שְׁמַע, פַּתַּח, or is changed to

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Pathaḥ, הַנֹּטַע Ps 94:9 לְרֹקַע Ps 136:6 (but also אֹבַד עֵצוֹת Dt 32:28, although the vowel is not followed by a laryngeal). We also meet a Ḥireḳ instead of Ṣere:[108] תּוֹמִיךְ Ps 16:5, יוֹסִיף Is 29:14 and 38:5.[109]

p. *Rem*. 1. The tone is milra even before a tone-syllable; for if the tone were shifted to the penultima, the Ṣere would have to change to Segol, and the word could not then be distinguished from nouns of the פֶּעֶל formation. But in the ל״ה verbs, where the vowel in the second syllable is Segol and where no nouns of the פֶּעֶל formation exist [but see above, note 64], the tone does shift back to the penultima when followed by a tone-syllable, e. g. בֹּנֶה עִיר Gn 4:17, בֹּנֶה חַיִץ Ez 13:10, עֹשֵׂה פֶלֶא Ex 15:11 [in our m.t. עֹשֵׂה, with Ṣere under שׂ], עֹשֶׂה חָיִל Nu 24:18. Furthermore, when a ל״ה verb occurs with Ṣere, this Ṣere does not change to Segol, even on the retraction of the tone,[110] e. g. רֹעֵה צֹאן Gn 46:34. The same is true of the ל״א verbs, in which the second syllable always has a Ṣere, e. g. רֹפֵא לָךְ 2K 20:5 וּבוֹרֵא רָע, Is 45:7 (but וּבוֹרֵא חֹשֶׁךְ ibid).

q. *Rem*. 2. When the Ṣere in the strong verbs of the פֹּעֵל formation loses the tone it is compensated by Metheg, under the influence of which it is allowed its full sound, e. g. גֹּדֵר־גָּדֵר Ez 22:30 [cf. above, note 24].

r. *Rem*. 3. In בֹּעֵרָה Hos 7:4, a ה is afformed without denoting feminine gender, as evidenced by the fact that the tone is not shifted forward, cf. הַחַרְסָה ,לַיְלָה Ju 14:18, etc.

s. *Rem*. 4. It occurs sometimes with suffixed Yod, e. g. שֹׁכְנִי Dt 33:16, חֹצְבִי Is 22:16, etc.[111]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

t. k]. Also שֹׁפְטָה Ju 4:4[112] and נֹטֵרָה Can 1:6. In pause the vowel of the second syllable sometimes changes to Ḳameṣ, יֹשָׁבֶת Jos 2:15, עֹמָדֶת Ec 1:4, but we also find הַנֹּפֶלֶת Am 9:11 and הַמֹּלֶכֶת 1Chr 7:18. When the third radical is a laryngeal it takes a Pathaḥ and influences the preceding vowel to change to Pathaḥ, e. g. יוֹדַעַת, בֹּרַחַת, etc.

u. *Rem.* 1. It sometimes occurs with suffixed Yod, אוֹיַבְתִּי Mi 7:8, אֹהַבְתִּי Hos 10:11.[111] The tone, which is on the penultima in these two cases, bears out the supposition that the Yod is not a pronominal suffix, for in that case it would attract the tone.

v. l]. In the construct state: שֹׁמְרֵי Nu 3:28. When two Yods concur, as in the case of the ל״ה verbs, one of them is orthographically dropped, though it is retained in pronunciation, e. g. וְקֹוֵי Is 40:31 (cf. בְּלוֹיֵ . . . וּבְלוֹיֵ Jr 38:11 [for בְּלוֹיֵי, plur. constr. of בְּלוֹי]). Other, less frequent, forms of this paradigm are: מַשְׁכִּימֵי . . . מְאַחֲרֵי Is 5:11, אֹהֲבֵי ibid 56:10. [For detailed discussion of this type see below § 45.]

w. m]. This is sometimes written defectively, לָבֻשׁ Pr 31:21. When the third radical is a laryngeal [except א] it takes a furtive Pathaḥ, נָטוּעַ, סָרוּחַ, etc. In the construct state the Ḳameṣ changes to Shewa, בְּרוּךְ Gn 24:31, נְבוּב Ex 27:8, when the first radical is a laryngeal, it takes either Ḥatef Pathaḥ, חֲבוּר Hos 4:17, or Ḥatef Segol, עֱרוּךְ Joel 2:5.

x. *Rem.* 1. The following instances are not to be taken as constructs, but as absolutes, although they are not followed by prepositions: תָּפוּשׂ זָהָב Hab 2:19, חָגוּר כְּלֵי מִלְחָמָה Ju 18:11 and 2S 21:16, לָבוּשׁ בְּגָדִים Za 3:3, קָרוּעַ כֻּתָּנְתּוֹ 2S 15:32.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Pathaḥ, הַנֹּטַע Ps 94:9 לְרֹקַע Ps 136:6 (but also אֹבַד עֵצוֹת Dt 32:28, although the vowel is not followed by a laryngeal). We also meet a Ḥireḳ instead of Ṣere:[108] תּוֹמִיךְ Ps 16:5, יוֹסִיף Is 29:14 and 38:5.[109]

p. *Rem*. 1. The tone is milra even before a tone-syllable; for if the tone were shifted to the penultima, the Ṣere would have to change to Segol, and the word could not then be distinguished from nouns of the פֹּעַל formation. But in the ל״ה verbs, where the vowel in the second syllable is Segol and where no nouns of the פֹּעַל formation exist [but see above, note 64], the tone does shift back to the penultima when followed by a tone-syllable, e. g. בֹּנֶה עִיר Gn 4:17, בֹּנֶה חַיִץ Ez 13:10, עֹשֶׂה פֶּלֶא Ex 15:11 [in our m.t. עֹשֵׂה, with Ṣere under שׂ], עֹשֶׂה חָיִל Nu 24:18. Furthermore, when a ל״ה verb occurs with Ṣere, this Ṣere does not change to Segol, even on the retraction of the tone,[110] e. g. רֹעֵה צֹאן Gn 46:34. The same is true of the ל״א verbs, in which the second syllable always has a Ṣere, e. g. רֹפֵא לָךְ 2K 20:5 וּבֹרֵא רָע, Is 45:7 (but וּבֹרֵא חֹשֶׁךְ ibid).

q. *Rem*. 2. When the Ṣere in the strong verbs of the פֹּעֵל formation loses the tone it is compensated by Metheg, under the influence of which it is allowed its full sound, e. g. גֹּדֵר־גָּדֵר Ez 22:30 [cf. above, note 24].

r. *Rem*. 3. In בֹּעֵרָה Hos 7:4, a ה is afformed without denoting feminine gender, as evidenced by the fact that the tone is not shifted forward, cf. לַיְלָה, הַחַרְסָה Ju 14:18, etc.

s. *Rem*. 4. It occurs sometimes with suffixed Yod, e. g. שֹׁכְנִי Dt 33:16, חֹצְבִי Is 22:16, etc.[111]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

t. k]. Also שֹׁפְטָה Ju 4:4[112] and נֹטֵרָה Can 1:6. In pause the vowel of the second syllable sometimes changes to Ḳameṣ, יֹשָׁבֶת Jos 2:15, עֹמָדֶת Ec 1:4, but we also find הַנֹּפֶלֶת Am 9:11 and הַמֹּלֶכֶת 1Chr 7:18. When the third radical is a laryngeal it takes a Pathaḥ and influences the preceding vowel to change to Pathaḥ, e. g. יוֹדַעַת, בֹּרַחַת, etc.

u. *Rem.* 1. It sometimes occurs with suffixed Yod, אוֹיַבְתִּי Mi 7:8, אֹהַבְתִּי Hos 10:11.[111] The tone, which is on the penultima in these two cases, bears out the supposition that the Yod is not a pronominal suffix, for in that case it would attract the tone.

v. l]. In the construct state: שֹׁמְרֵי Nu 3:28. When two Yods concur, as in the case of the ל"ה verbs, one of them is orthographically dropped, though it is retained in pronunciation, e. g. וְקוֹי Is 40:31 (cf. בְּלוֹיֵ . . . וּבְלוֹיֵ Jr 38:11 [for בְּלוֹיֵי, plur. constr. of בְּלוֹי]). Other, less frequent, forms of this paradigm are: מַשְׁכִּימֵי . . . מְאַחֲרֵי Is 5:11, אֹהֲבֵי ibid 56:10. [For detailed discussion of this type see below § 45.]

w. m]. This is sometimes written defectively, לָבֻשׁ Pr 31:21. When the third radical is a laryngeal [except א] it takes a furtive Pathaḥ, נָטוּעַ, סָרוּחַ, etc. In the construct state the Ḳameṣ changes to Shewa, בְּרוּךְ Gn 24:31, נְבוּב Ex 27:8, when the first radical is a laryngeal, it takes either Ḥatef Pathaḥ, חֲבוּר Hos 4:17, or Ḥatef Segol, עֱרוּךְ Joel 2:5.

x. *Rem.* 1. The following instances are not to be taken as constructs, but as absolutes, although they are not followed by prepositions: תָּפוּשׂ זָהָב Hab 2:19, חָגוּר כְּלִי מִלְחָמָה Ju 18:11 and 2S 21:16, לָבוּשׁ בְּגָדִים Za 3:3, קָרוּעַ כֻּתָּנְתּוֹ 2S 15:32.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

y. n]. In the construct state the Ḳameṣ changes to Pathaḥ and the ה to ת; וַעֲצוּבַת Is 54:6, וּשְׁכוּרַת ib. 51:21. In the latter instance the genitive (of וּשְׁכוּרַת) הַצָּרוֹת may be implied,[113] or the ending may be a feminine suffix instead of ־ָה, which is common in Hebrew, e. g. רַבַּת Ps 123:4, שִׁפְעַת 2K 9:17, מַכַּת Is 14:6 etc. This form occurs sometimes with suffixed Yod, e. g. גְּנֻבְתִי and וּגְנֻבְתִי Gn 31:39.[111]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOTES: CHAPTER THREE A

[80] Dunash was the first to employ the term קלים and כבדים in *Tesh. ag. Menaḥem*, p. 6a. More frequently, however, he designates the Ḳal and the Pi'el respectively, by רפה and חזק. It was Ḥayyuj who first laid down this terminology definitely and consistently, which was adopted by subsequent grammarians. His interpretation of these terms is, however, somewhat different from that given here by Ḳimḥi. The "light" conjugations are so called according to Ḥayyuj (N. 12): (a) "because the latent א between the פ (of פָעַל) pointed with Ḳameṣ and the ע (cf. above, note 11) is dropped in the Imperfect, and the Ḳameṣ becomes quiescent Shewa, as in אֶפְעַל;" (b) because no מ is preformed in the active and passive participles of these conjugations as is done in the case of the "heavy" conjugations. Ḳimḥi's interpretation of the Ḳal given here is severely criticized by Profiat Duran (*Ma'ase Efod* 53f.), who regards it as erroneous and not at all implicit in Ḥayyuj's definition. This criticism is, however, not entirely justified. That not only the preformed Mem, but also any preformative, is characteristic of the "heavy" conjugations may be inferred from Ḥayyuj's subsequent remark (ibid.), to the effect that the Hif'il is "heavy" because of the preformed Hē in the Perfect, as well as the preformed Mem in the participles. Ḳimḥi merely attempts to simplify and to condense, in his own manner, Ḥayyuj's verbose and involved explanation; and Efodi's criticism results from his failure to understand Ḳimḥi's concise method. But Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 37) seems to have construed Ḥayyuj in this instance in the same sense as Efódi, since he states as one of the functions of the Hē:—the power to transform a "light" into a "heavy" conjugation (e. g. Hif'il), because it entails a Mem in the active and passive participles. The reason for singling out the Mem preformative as the characteristic of the "heavy" conjugations is doubtless the fact that it alone is typical of all these conjugations in their respective participles. Modern grammarians accept Ḳimḥi's brief definition of the Ḳal, cf. Ges.-K. § 39e. It is interesting to note that Ibn Ezra distinctly remarks (Ṣ. 50a) that there is no Ḳal besides פָעַל (ואין בנין קל רק פָעַל לבדו), the Nif'al being regarded by him as a בנין נוסף (ibid. 49b).

[81] Ḥayyuj is generally regarded as the originator of the triliteral

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

theory of Hebrew stems. His predecessors: Saadia, Ibn Ḳoreish, David b. Abraham, and Menaḥem; as well as Nathan (the author of the 'Aruk), etc., operated with biliteral and even uniliteral stems. The triliteral theory was, however, already forecast by Dunash, who refers the form יֵבוֹשׁ Hos 13:15 to the stem יבשׁ in which the Yod represents, in his opinion, both the preformative and the initial radical (cf. *Tesh. ag. Menaḥem* 30). Similar inferences can be drawn from his statements on pp. 16f., 20, 23, and 26. This does not detract, however, from the credit justly accorded to Ḥayyuj for having first propounded and applied this theory scientifically, systematically, and consistently. Some of the later grammarians: Samuel ha-Nagid, Ibn Ezra, and others differed with Ḥayyuj with regard to the triliterality of the ע״וי and ע״ע verbs (cf. the introduction to *Opuscules d'Abou'l Walid* XXVI f. and Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc., 89f.). Ibn Janaḥ, on the other hand, regarded as biliteral such words as סַל, טַס, טַף, טַל, דַּד, נַג, נַב, which occur with Dagesh in the second radical but never with the duplication of this radical (cf. loc. cit.). The modern grammarians are, likewise, divided in their opinions on this matter. Some are consistent triliteralists (Philippi, Barth, Lambert, and Brockelmann). Others assume a monosyllabic or biliteral ground-form for the ע״וי and ע״ע verbs (Ewald, Boettcher, Stade, Mueller, Noeldeke, and Wellhausen). Cf. Ges.-K. 176[1] and 194[1]; also Noeldeke, Neue Beitrage, Strassburg, 1904, 109ff.; and Ges.-Bergstrasser II, § 1d. According to Sayce, *Introduction to the Science of Language* I, 202 "attempts like that to reduce the triliteral roots of the Semitic tongues to biliteral ones are contrary to the whole tendency of language."

[82] Pursuant to the method adopted in presenting this Grammar (cf. Translator's Preface, p. 2f.), the Hebrew terms עָבָר, עָתִיד, and בֵּינוֹנִי or עוֹמֵד, employed by the Hebrew grammarians, will be rendered throughout this book, for the convenience of the modern student of grammar, by Perfect, Imperfect, and Participle, respectively. It is, however, to be borne in mind that the mediaeval grammarians, both Hebrew and Arabic, thought in terms of Indo-Germanic tenses, and they used a terminology expressive of these tense-ideas. This misconception involved them, of course, in many difficulties, and they had to resort to artificial explanations to extricate themselves therefrom, cf. below § 77b and note 628.

[83] Nothing is left of the grammatical works of this apparently thorough grammarian, except a few quotations from his book, *Sefer ha-Shalem*, given by Ḳimḥi (*Mikhlol*, ed. Lyk, 3b, 7a, etc. and in Shor. s.v.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

דרש). As to his identity see Geiger in *Oṣar Neḥmad* II, 159ff. The rule ascribed here by Ḳimḥi to Jacob b. El'azar, which Ibn Janaḥ claims to have originated, is referred by Kirchheim (Introduction to *Riḳma*, XII, note 2), at the suggestion of Baer, to a note in the Masora Parva on וַיֹּאכַֽל Gn 3:6 (ויאמר וילך ויאכל וכו' כולם פתחים ואפילו באתנחתא וסו״פ דתקנתא לתקנתא לא עבדינן), in accordance with which a Pathaḥ originating from another vowel (Ṣere) does not change any further in pause. This note must have escaped, in the opinion of Kirchheim, the attention of these grammarians.

[84] The term "euphonic Dagesh" (דגש לתפארת הקריאה) was first introduced by Ḳimḥi and was accepted by subsequent grammarians. This term was probably suggested to Ḳimḥi by Ibn Janaḥ's description of this Dagesh (*Riḳ*. 143), in Ibn Tibbon's rendering, לְצַחְצַח האות ההיא הדגושה. Cf. also Ibn Ezra's expression in the same respect: דֶרֶךְ צַחוֹת (commentary to Ex 2:3 and 15:17, also to Ps 141:3). But even previously, Menaḥem speaks of it in the same vein: אך דגש ורפה ישנו לְצַחְצוּחַ לשון אשר בהם תִּכּוֹן המלה בפה ותחישב היטב. Joseph Ḳimḥi describes the pausal Dagesh as דגש לתפארת סוף פסוק ואתנח. Ibn Janaḥ correctly and distinctly designates the Dagesh in נָתָּנוּ, גָשְׁתָּה, etc., as Pausal Dagesh (loc. cit.: בעמוד על המלה ובהפסק הדברים), whose function is to add emphasis to the syllable in pause. All other instances of "euphonic Dagesh" are discussed and variously explained by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 143–145, also *Opusc*. 21f.). Cf. also Pinsker, *Mabo*, pp. 7 and 70ff. It may be significant to note in this connection that the terms מפאר, מפואר, פיאור (=Arabic *tafkhīm*) are used by Saadia and Dunash to indicate amplification for emphasis, as in the case of the "extraneous" letters in לְהַנְחוֹתָם בְּהַדֶּרֶךְ Ne 9:19, יְהוֹשִׁיעַ, תַּגְמוּלוֹהִי, עָזְמוֹ etc., etc. (cf. Dunash, *Tesh. ag. Saadia* pp. 30f. and 37, also Bacher's *Anf*. 56f.).

[85] That the tone in לָחֶם is Milra and cannot, therefore, be taken in the sense of לֶחֶם (bread) was already observed by Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Menaḥem* 32). Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 244) construes it as a Perfect Ḳal of the קָטֵל formation, with Segol in place of Ṣere. Cf. also Ben Yehuda s.v. and below, note 396.

[86] According to Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 88f.) the Infinitives *Katōl* and *Ḳetol* are independent forms, having the same function, and they can be used interchangeably. A definite distinction is made by Samuel ha-Nagid, who calls the first *Verbal Infinitive* and the second *Nominal Infinitive* (*maṣdar fi'ili* and *maṣdar 'ismi*); cf. Kokowzoff's *Noviye Materiali* 133 (Russian text). Pseudo-Ibn Yashush, ibid. 144, rejects

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

theory of Hebrew stems. His predecessors: Saadia, Ibn Ḳoreish, David b. Abraham, and Menaḥem; as well as Nathan (the author of the 'Aruk), etc., operated with biliteral and even uniliteral stems. The triliteral theory was, however, already forecast by Dunash, who refers the form יָבוֹשׁ Hos 13:15 to the stem יבשׁ in which the Yod represents, in his opinion, both the preformative and the initial radical (cf. *Tesh. ag. Menaḥem* 30). Similar inferences can be drawn from his statements on pp. 16f., 20, 23, and 26. This does not detract, however, from the credit justly accorded to Ḥayyuj for having first propounded and applied this theory scientifically, systematically, and consistently. Some of the later grammarians: Samuel ha-Nagid, Ibn Ezra, and others differed with Ḥayyuj with regard to the triliterality of the ע״וי and ע״ע verbs (cf. the introduction to *Opuscules d'Abou'l Walid* XXVI f. and Bacher's *Ibn Esra* etc., 89f.). Ibn Janaḥ, on the other hand, regarded as biliteral such words as קַל, טַס, טַף, טַל, דַּר, גַּג, גַּב, which occur with Dagesh in the second radical but never with the duplication of this radical (cf. loc. cit.). The modern grammarians are, likewise, divided in their opinions on this matter. Some are consistent triliteralists (Philippi, Barth, Lambert, and Brockelmann). Others assume a monosyllabic or biliteral ground-form for the ע״וי and ע״ע verbs (Ewald, Boettcher, Stade, Mueller, Noeldeke, and Wellhausen). Cf. Ges.-K. 176[r] and 194[1]; also Noeldeke, Neue Beitrage, Strassburg, 1904, 109ff.; and Ges.-Bergstrasser II, § 1d. According to Sayce, *Introduction to the Science of Language* I, 202 "attempts like that to reduce the triliteral roots of the Semitic tongues to biliteral ones are contrary to the whole tendency of language."

[82] Pursuant to the method adopted in presenting this Grammar (cf. Translator's Preface, p. 2f.), the Hebrew terms עָבַר, עָתִיד, and בֵּינוֹנִי or עוֹמֵד, employed by the Hebrew grammarians, will be rendered throughout this book, for the convenience of the modern student of grammar, by Perfect, Imperfect, and Participle, respectively. It is, however, to be borne in mind that the mediaeval grammarians, both Hebrew and Arabic, thought in terms of Indo-Germanic tenses, and they used a terminology expressive of these tense-ideas. This misconception involved them, of course, in many difficulties, and they had to resort to artificial explanations to extricate themselves therefrom, cf. below § 77b and note 628.

[83] Nothing is left of the grammatical works of this apparently thorough grammarian, except a few quotations from his book, *Sefer ha-Shalem*, given by Ḳimḥi (*Mikhlol*, ed. Lyk, 3b, 7a, etc. and in Shor. s.v.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

דרש). As to his identity see Geiger in *Oṣar Neḥmad* II, 159ff. The rule ascribed here by Ḳimḥi to Jacob b. El'azar, which Ibn Janaḥ claims to have originated, is referred by Kirchheim (Introduction to *Riḳma*, XII, note 2), at the suggestion of Baer, to a note in the Masora Parva on וַיֹּאכַל Gn 3:6 (ויאמר וילך ויאכל וכו' כולם פתחים ואפילו באתנחתא וסו"פ דתקנתא לתקנתא לא עבדינן), in accordance with which a Pathaḥ originating from another vowel (Ṣere) does not change any further in pause. This note must have escaped, in the opinion of Kirchheim, the attention of these grammarians.

[84] The term "euphonic Dagesh" (דגש לתפארת הקריאה) was first introduced by Ḳimḥi and was accepted by subsequent grammarians. This term was probably suggested to Ḳimḥi by Ibn Janaḥ's description of this Dagesh (*Riḳ*. 143), in Ibn Tibbon's rendering, לְצַחְצֵחַ האות ההיא הדגושה. Cf. also Ibn Ezra's expression in the same respect: דֶּרֶךְ צחות (commentary to Ex 2:3 and 15:17, also to Ps 141:3). But even previously, Menaḥem speaks of it in the same vein: אך דגש ורפה ישנו לְצַחְצוּחַ לשון אשר בהם תִּכּוֹן המלה בפה ותתישב היטב. Joseph Ḳimḥi describes the pausal Dagesh as דגוש לתפארת סוף פסוק ואתנח. Ibn Janaḥ correctly and distinctly designates the Dagesh in נְתָּנוּ, גִשְׁתָּה, etc., as Pausal Dagesh (loc. cit.: בעמוד על המלה ובהפסק הדברים), whose function is to add emphasis to the syllable in pause. All other instances of "euphonic Dagesh" are discussed and variously explained by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 143–145, also *Opusc*. 21f.). Cf. also Pinsker, *Mabo*, pp. 7 and 70ff. It may be significant to note in this connection that the terms מפאר, מפואר, פיאור (=Arabic *tafkhīm*) are used by Saadia and Dunash to indicate amplification for emphasis, as in the case of the "extraneous" letters in לְהַנְחוֹתָם בְּהַדֶּרֶךְ Ne 9:19, יְהוֹשִׁיעַ, תְּגַמּוּלוֹהִי, עַצְמוֹ, etc., etc. (cf. Dunash, *Tesh. ag. Saadia* pp. 30f. and 37, also Bacher's *Anf*. 56f.).

[85] That the tone in לָחֶם is Milra and cannot, therefore, be taken in the sense of לֶחֶם (bread) was already observed by Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Menaḥem* 32). Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 244) construes it as a Perfect Ḳal of the פָּעֵל formation, with Segol in place of Ṣere. Cf. also Ben Yehuda s.v. and below, note 396.

[86] According to Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 88f.) the Infinitives *Katōl* and *Ḳetol* are independent forms, having the same function, and they can be used interchangeably. A definite distinction is made by Samuel ha-Nagid, who calls the first *Verbal Infinitive* and the second *Nominal Infinitive* (*maṣdar fi'ili* and *maṣdar 'ismi*); cf. Kokowzoff's *Noviye Materiali* 133 (Russian text). Pseudo-Ibn Yashush, ibid. 144, rejects

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

this distinction and recognizes only one type of Infinitive, *Ḳāṭōl*, n which the Ḳameṣ changes to Shewa under the first radical when it takes the prefixes בכלם, for the sake of euphony. This seems to be also the view of Ibn Janaḥ's opponent (cf. *Opusc.* 353) and of Ḳimḥi (cf. *Mikhlol*, ed. Lyk, pp. 31a, 38a, 73b). Modern grammarians distinguish clearly between these two forms, the first having evolved from an original *Ḳāṭāl* and is called Infinitive absolute, the second from *Ḳuṭul* and is called Infinitive construct. The latter is the basis for the inflections of the Infinitive.

[87] According to Ibn Ezra, in his commentary ad l., neither וְגָדֵל nor וּבָשֵׁל are to be regarded as Infinitives. The former, he maintains, is Perfect, while the latter is an adjective on the analogy of זָקֵן and צָמֵא. Ibn Janaḥ (*Rik.* 59 and 190) takes both as adjectives. This opinion with regard to וּבָשֵׁל is attacked by the anonymous author of the Hebrew grammar published by Poznański, pp. 4–6, who, in turn, construes it as Infinitive Pi'el, with the lengthening of the vowel under the ב to compensate for the Dagesh in the שׁ, the characteristic of the Pi'el, on the analogy of הָתֵל Jb 13:9 (cf. below, note 127).

[88] Ibn Janaḥ (*op. cit.*, pp. 88–91) mentions also, among others, the following remarkable forms of the Infinitive: (a) with suffixed ת, יְבֹשֶׁת Gn 8:7, יְכֹלֶת Nu 14:16 and צַדֶּקְתֵּךְ Ez 16:52; (b) with prefixed מ (after the Aramaic), of the types מִפְעַל, מִשְׁכַּב Nu 31:17 and Ez 23:17, מִקְרָא Nu 10:2, etc.; מִפְעֵל, מִסְתֵּר Is 53:3, מַהְפֵּכַת ibid 13:19, etc.; מִפְעוֹל, מִשְׁלוֹחַ, Es 9:19, מָבוֹא Ez 33:31, מְמוֹתִי. ibid 8:8, etc. Cf. also below, note 304.

[89] Ibn Janaḥ (ibid. 89) regards these forms as Infinitives of the Ḳal. Ibn Ezra, however, takes לְאַהֲבָה as Inf. Pi'el and לְאַשְׁמָה as a noun (Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc., p. 105).

[90] This form is construed as Infinitive with expletive Nun by Ibn Janaḥ (cf. *Opusc.* 215, where the function of the Nun in combination with verbs is elaborately discussed; also *Rik.*, pp. 36 and 89). So also Barth § 200e, who adduces in proof the spirantization of the ד, a characteristic of the Inf., cf. אָבְדוֹ, מָלְכוֹ, etc.

[91] זָעֳמָה is accordingly for זָעְמָה. So also Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 135) who adduces the analogy of בְּמֹצַאֲכֶם Gn 32:20 for בְּמָצְאֲכֶם (cf. below, note 180), although he also offers the suggestion that it may be an Imperative of the Po'el conjugation. The modern grammarians, likewise, construe it as cohortative Ḳal for זָעְמָה; cf. תֹּאֲרוֹ for תָּאֳרוֹ Is 52:14. This Ḥolem represents but the original *ŭ* of the Imperative *Ḳŭṭŭl*, the Imperfect being יִזְעַם; see below, note 93.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[92] The Dagesh in the צ is intended, according to Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc* 20–21), to prevent it from being pronounced like ש on account of the ר immediately following it. Cf. also Pinsker (*Mabo*, p. 71) and above, notes 52 and 84.

[93] The Ḥireḳ under the first radical may be explained, according to Pinsker (commentary to *Yesod Mispar*, *Mabo* p. 154f.), as being in place of its cognate vowel-Ḳibbuṣ, the original vowel in the Imperative (see above, notes 16 and 91). Thus the form קִטְלוּ (cf. מִשְׁכוּ Ex 12:21) is, according to him, in place of קֻטְלוּ, the kindred form of מָשְׁכוּ) קָטְלוּ Ez 32:20). The prevalence of the forms with Ḥireḳ under the first radical with the ־ִי and ־וּ endings may be due, in his opinion, to assonance, as evidenced by the predominance, on the other hand, of the form with Ḳameṣ ḥatuf under the initial radical with suffixes ־ָה (שָׁמְרָה). Cf., however, Barth (*ZDMG*, 1889, p. 182).

[94] The latter is the opinion of Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 85 and 89). The last three examples constituted a subject of serious dispute among the mediaeval grammarians. Ibn Janaḥ (ibid. and *Opusc*. 58f. and 100) construes them as Infinitives, while Samuel ha-Nagid takes them as Imperatives (cf. Kokowzoff, *Noviye Materiali*, p. 169[1] [Russian text]). Ibn Bal'am supports Ibn Janaḥ's view and characterizes the Nagid as an ignoramus (ibid.). Some of the modern grammarians, however, regard these forms, like the Nagid, as Imperatives fem. plur., with the rejection of the suffix נָה; cf. Ew. § 226a and Bauer-Leander § 41g. Others construe them as 2 m. sing. (St. § 591d and Koenig I, 163). This view was already suggested by pseudo-Ibn Yashush (cf. Kokowzoff, op. cit. p. 170), who, furthermore, explains the sing. form as due to the omission of the word יוֹשֵׁב before בּוֹטְחוֹת, to whom the command is addressed. Boettcher § 606, 3 shares Ibn Janaḥ's opinion, considering the suffix as ה locale. But according to Barth, *ZDMG*, 56, 247, and Brockelmann (*GvG*, § 260c), these instances are remains of the 2f. pl. with the ending ־ָה, which are regular forms in Ethiopic, Aramaic and Assyrian.

[95] On the nature, development and use of this tense, as well as of the Perfect, see below § 75 and note 628. As to the use of the term see above, note 82.

[96] The original Semitic vowel of the preformatives in the Imperfect is Pathaḥ, which is still found in the Canaanitish glosses of the Tell-el-Amarna letters (about 1400 B.C.E.) (*yazkur*). This Pathaḥ was attenuated to Ḥireḳ in Hebrew, Aramaic and Ethiopic; but it reasserts itself in Hebrew before laryngeals (יַחְמֹד); as well as in the ע״וּ and in the ע״ע,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

in which case it is lengthened to Ḳameṣ before the tone (יָקוּם, יָשִׁיר, יָסֹב). In the יִפְעַל formations this Pathaḥ was dissimilated to Ḥireḳ early in the history of the language. Hence, the latter vowel is preserved, with thẹ necessary modifications, even before laryngeals and in the ע"וי and ע"ע (יֵבוֹשׁ, יֶחְסַר Is 29:22 [see below, note 218], יִדַּל ibid 17:4, יֵרַךְ Jr 51:46, etc.; cf. below § 36, remark 1, and § 38d, also note 253). See Brock., *Sem. Sprachw.* 126f.; but also Ges.-Bergstrasser II, §§ 3e and 14f[1].

[97] This form is perhaps to be explained as a blending of the verbal form (Imperfect) with the interjection *ā*, frequently employed in Arabic; cf. Bauer-Leander § 36d. Others (cf. Brockel. *Sem. Sprachw.* 125) trace the suffix back to the syllable *an* employed in Arabic for the formation of the "energetic" mood and sometimes appearing in Hebrew before suffixes (see below, note 171 and Ges. K. § 48c, note 1). Cf. also the Arabic pausal form of the "energetic" mood *yăḳtŭlā*.

[98] Ibn Janaḥ, likewise, reads these two instances with Ḥatef Ḳameṣ under ק (*Riḳ.* 101). So also *Min. Shai.* In our text, however, both have Shewa under the ק.

[99] So also most of the modern grammarians (cf. Koenig I, 190). According to Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 81) the ה in these two cases is pleonastic, as in הַשְׁפָּלָה Ez 21:31 (for הַשְׁפַּל), and not cohortative. Koenig (op. cit.) wrongly attributes to Ḳimḥi the opinion that the ending ָה in יִדְשְׁנָה is pronominal, on the basis of his interpretation in *Shor.* s.v. יְשִׂימָה דֶשֶׁן. As a matter of fact this interpretation of Ḳimḥi is taken from Ibn Janaḥ's dictionary s.v., where the latter distinctly regards the ה as pleonastic and not pronominal. The expression יְשִׂימָה דֶשֶׁן is, therefore, merely exegetical and has no particular bearing on the ending. Some of the moderns read here יְדַשְּׁנֶהָ (cf. Ges.-K. § 48d and Bauer-Leander 329). The most plausible explanation of this form is probably that of Ibn Ezra (*Moz.* 16a), namely, that this is a quadriliteral form like תְּתַחֲרֶה Jr 12:5. Cf. also Ben Yehuda s.v.

[100] Ḳimḥi seems to be the first to have sensed the peculiar character of the Waw Consecutive, since he designates it by a special term ו' הַשֵּׁרוּת and devotes a paragraph to a discussion of its uses and vocalization (Lyk ed. 48b, etc.). His predecessors made no clear distinction between the Waw Consecutive and the Waw Copulative, although they observed their respective functions (cf. Ibn Janaḥ, *Riḳ.* 119ff.; Joseph Ḳimḥi, *Zik.* 8f. and 12). In accordance with our method (cf. translator's Preface and above, note 82) the modern terminology is employed here. On the reason for this terminology and its meaning see Ges.-K. 133[1].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[101] This traditional pronunciation is mentioned also by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 45 and 120) and by Ibn Ezra (Ṣ. 2b and comment. to Ex 1:2). Ḥayyuj (loc. cit.), likewise, explains this pronunciation on the principle of euphony.

[102] This rule given by Baer (quoted by Kirchheim in *Riḳ*. 119, note 2) is as follows: Before a tone-syllable with a disjunctive accent the prefixes ובכל take Ḳameṣ, before such a syllable with conjunctive accent they are usually pointed with Shewa.

[103] These two forms are discussed elaborately by Ibn Janaḥ in *Opusc*., pp. 338–342, where numerous other examples are cited in which the Waw Consecutive is vocalized like the Waw Copulative. Cf. also Ben Asher, *Diḳ*. p. 60.

[104] The very first attempt at paradigm arrangement, on the ground of quotations by Dunash (Bacher's *Anf*. 52f.), was that of Saadia, who employed the verb שמע as the model and confined himself to the Ḳal and Hif'il forms only. The paradigm פעל, borrowed from the Arabic grammarians, was probably first adopted throughout, according to Bacher, by Ibn Janaḥ; although it had been already extensively used previously by Dunash (ibid. 109), and both by his disciples (*Tesh*. 35) and by the disciples of Menaḥem (*Tesh*. 70 and 101). Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik*. 14) was the first to give the Pu'al and the Hof'al the prominence of distinct conjugations. The order adopted by him was: (1) Ḳal, (2) Pi'el, (3) Hif'il, (4) Nif'al, (5) Hithpa'el, (6) Pu'al, (7) Hof'al, (8) Po'el; employing, after Ibn Ezra, the paradigm שמר. Ḥayyuj, Ibn Janaḥ, and Ibn Ezra placed the Hif'il before the Pi'el and treated only of six conjugations, omitting the Pu'al and Hof'al as separate conjugations (cf. *Ma'ase Efod* 53). Moses Ḳimḥi is responsible for the final and standard arrangement, which has been followed with slight modifications to this date, namely: Ḳal, Nif'al, Pi'el, Pu'al, Hif'il, Hof'al, Po'el, Hithpa'el. His paradigm פקד was also accepted by the subsequent grammarians, but it has been replaced, since the time of Danz, by קטל. See also, on other arrangements of the conjugations, the anonymous Hebrew grammar, published by Poznański, p. 8 and note 21. David Ḳimḥi is severely criticized by Efodi (loc. cit. 86 and 91f.) for introducing this paradigm and arrangement of the conjugations. The passive of the Ḳal, Efodi avers, is not the Nif'al, as maintained by Ḳimḥi, but the Pu'al (cf. below, note 114). The Nif'al, therefore, should not follow the Ḳal. For the convenience of the modern student of grammar the paradigm קטל is generally used in this book instead of the original Ḳimḥian paradigm פקד.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[105] As a matter of fact the ending ת- (t) is the more original and is the common feminine characteristic termination of both verbs and nouns in the Semitic languages. Under the influence of a preceding vowel this characteristic ending tends to fall away, by partial assimilation to the open-lip position of the vowel (cf. above, note 35), also in Arabic and in Aramaic in nouns; but it is retained in both these languages in the verb, in the 3rd person feminine; cf. Arabic *ḳatalat* and Aramaic קְטָלַת. In Hebrew this ending returns when attached to pronominal suffixes in the verb (קְטָלַתְנִי) and when in a close annexation of a following genitive, namely, in the construct state. Cf. below, note 365; also Koenig I, 219 and II, 419f. A more elaborate treatment of this phenomenon in Semitic and other languages is presented by O'Leary *Comp. Grammar of Semitic Language*, p. 54ff.

[106] This etymology of צָקוּן was suggested by Isaac Ibn Chiquitilla and was accepted by Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 104). It is also to be inferred from Saadia's translation (*Ṣabbu*). So also Ibn Gabirol (*'Anaḳ* vv. 183f.) and the moderns (cf. Bauer-Leander 404).

[107] This explanation seems quite plausible, since there apparently existed a similarity in the pronunciation of אֶ and יְ; witness the transliteration in the LXX of יִצְחָק (Isaak), also the Syriac *'iraḥ* alongside of *yiraḥ* "month", *'ith* (cf. אִיתַי Dn 2:10, etc.) corresponding to the Hebrew יֵשׁ. Cf. also the Kethib אִשׁ for יֵשׁ 2S 14:19, Mi 6:10, Pr 18:24; also אִישַׁי for יִשַׁי 1Chr 2:13. See also Ges.-K. § 47b and note 1.

[108] In addition to these forms of the participle Ibn Janaḥ mentions also the following (*Riḳ.* 87): פָּעֵל (יָרֵא, חָרֵד, חָפֵץ, שָׂמֵחַ), פָּעוּל (עָצוּם Ex 1:9, עָרוּם Gn 3:1), פָּעוֹל (בָּגוֹדָה Jr 3:7 = בּוֹגֵדָה, cf. below, note 433), פָּעָל (שָׁב, קָם, etc.). According to Ibn Barun (ed. Kokowzoff) 52, such forms of the active participle as בָּטוּחַ Is 26:3, אָנוּשׁ ibid 17:11, and שָׁחוּט Jr 9:7, correspond to the Arabic participle *fa'ul*. With regard to שָׁחוּט Joseph Ḳimḥi, quoted by David Ḳimḥi in *Shor.* s.v., also construes it as active participle. In the category of the participles of the פָּעוֹל formation, Ibn Barun (ibid.) includes also such instances as עָשׁוֹק Jr 22:3 and חָמוֹץ Is 1:17.

[109] Ḥayyuj (N. 27 s.v. יסף), likewise, regards these examples as participles, probably after Saadia (commentary ad l.). Ibn Chiquitilla, however, quoted in Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. 135, construes יוֹסִיף as Imperfect in the third person, with reference to the subject in the first person, instances of which incongruence are found abundantly in Hebrew (cf. below § 82). See also below, note 173.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[110] The reason for this is the fact that this Ṣere is in an open syllable and can, therefore, be retained even without the tone; cf. above § 9.

[111] Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Saadia* p. 5) already calls attention to the fact that the Yod in these instances is pleonastic. Cf. also Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 27). This termination, as well as the ending וֹ– in such instances as בְּנוֹ צִפֹּר Nu 23:18, בְּנוֹ בְעֹר ibid 24:3.15, לְמַעְיְנוֹ־מָיִם Ps 114:8, חַיְתוֹ אֶרֶץ Gn 1:24, etc., are called *litterae compaginis* (letters of connexion), since they are employed almost exclusively to designate close connexion of one noun with another. The origin of these terminations is still disputed by the moderns, and no satisfactory explanation has yet been offered. Some regard them as survivals of early case endings, namely, genitive-*i* and accusative-*a*, or nominative-*u*, respectively. Others trace them to the analogical influence of the oblique forms of אָב, אָח, חָם, which occur in the construct state with the ending ִי– (אֲבִי, אֲחִי, חֲמִי), and, primitively, with the accusative ending *ā*>*ō* (*'abā*, *'aḫā*, *ḥamā*), to emphasize relationship. Cf. Ges.-K. § 90k; Barth, *ZDMG*, LIII, 598; Brockelmann, *GvG*, I, 465. A more satisfactory explanation is given by Bauer-Leander 525ff., according to which the ending וֹ– is the normal pronominal suffix 3 M. sing., used anticipatorily, with the following noun in apposition, e. g. בְּנוֹ צִפֹּר "his son, namely, Ṣippor's," etc., while after having lost its pronominal sense, this suffix was used even before a feminine noun as in חַיְתוֹ אֶרֶץ. Such constructions are not uncommon in Hebrew, cf. below § 83a and note 656. The ending ִי– is similarly, though less convincingly, explained (Bauer-Leander 526).

[112] According to Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik.* 39), שֹׁפְטָה may be construed as a Perfect of the Po'el conjugation (cf. below § 26).

[113] Similarly Ibn Ezra in *Moz.* 29a: וַעֲנִיֵּנוּ שְׁכוּרַת יָיִן. In like manner he interprets other instances (cf. references in Bacher's *Ibn Esra* etc., p. 119, note 12), but see below, note 365.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

B. DERIVED CONJUGATIONS

§ 23. Nif'al: Its Functions and Essential Characteristics

a. The Nif'al is used to represent either the passive or the reflexive of the Ḳal,[114] e. g. נִשְׁמָר Hos 12:14 "he was kept (by a prophet)," לֹא נִשְׁמַר 2S 20:10, "he took no heed (to himself)." In cases where the Ḳal is intransitive in meaning the Nif'al is employed also as the passive of the Pi'el and the Hif'il,[115] e. g. נוֹשָׁבֶת Ex 16:35, נוֹשְׁבוּ Ez 26:19, the agent or the performer of the action in these two instances being מְיַשְּׁבִים (colonizers), not יוֹשְׁבִים (inhabitants). Similarly in נִגַּשׁ Gn 33:7, וְנִקְרַב Ex 22:7, הֲנִהְיָה Nu 4:23, the agents are מַגִּישׁ, מַקְרִיבִים (the judges) and עֹשֵׂה הַהֲוָיָה (God, the Cause of all being), respectively.

b. Some verbs in Nif'al bear no reference at all to an agent or performer of the action, e. g. נוֹתַר ,נִשְׁבַּע.[a] The form נִשְׁבַּרְתִּי Ez 6:9, is not to be regarded with Ibn Janaḥ as transitive, [*Riḳ*. 93, *Opusc*. 6–7 and *Shor*. 194], but as a regular passive, the particle אֵת following it meaning "from" as in אֶת הָעִיר Gn 44:4.[117] Similarly, נוֹצַר Is 43:10 is not to be construed as transitive, in the sense of "he created," as maintained by some grammarians,[b] but as

a. Ibn Janaḥ forms a Ḳal paradigm of this verb on the basis of הַיּוֹתֵר 1S 15:15. This word, however, may be regarded as an adjective or a noun.[116] Moreover, since the Nif'al of this verb exists, it is needless to form a Ḳal having the same meaning. It is, however, proper to form the Ḳal from an adjective or noun in cases where no Nif'al occurs; e. g., from דָּוֶה La 5:17, we may form a Ḳal paradigm דָּוָה, דָּוִיתָ, etc.

b. This interpretation purports to forestall any possibility of inferring from this verse (לְפָנַי לֹא־נוֹצַר אֵל) that God the Creator of all things was Himself created.

Digitized by Google | Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

a Nif'al participle, according to my father, in which the Ḳameṣ in the second syllable changes to Pathaḥ according to the rules of the construct, like וְנֶאֱמַן רוּחַ Pr 11:13. The meaning of the phrase, according to him, is therefore: "before I formed all things, there had been nothing formed by any other God."

c. The essential features of this conjugation are: (a) a prefixed Nun in the Perfect and the participle; (b) a Dagesh forte in the first radical, into which this prefixed Nun is assimilated, in the Imperfect, Imperative, and Infinitive. In the Imperative and Infinitive a ה is prefixed[: e. g. הִשָּׁמֵר].

d. Rem. 1. The reason for this assimilation of the Nun in the Imperative and Infinitive is to distinguish them from the Perfect of the same conjugation. The Imperative does, however, occur sometimes with Nun unassimilated, e. g. וְנִלְווּ Jr 50:5, וְנִקְבְּצוּ Jo 4:11.[118] Similarly, the Infinitive occurs frequently with prefixed Nun, e. g. נִשְׁאַל 1S 20:6, וְנִשְׁלוֹחַ Es 3:13, etc. [cf. below, note 120].

e. Rem. 2. The prefixed ה in the Infinitive is elided after prepositions, e. g. וּבִכָּשְׁלוֹ Pr 24:17 לֵרָאוֹת Dt 31:11, בֵּעָטֵף La 2:11, etc.

f. In the Infinitive, as well as in the Imperfect and Imperative, the second radical takes Ṣere, which changes to Segol when it loses the tone, or before pronominal suffixes of the second person, e. g. הִשָּׁמֶדְךָ Dt 28:19, הִבָּרַאֲךָ Ez 28:13 (with Pathaḥ under the ר, in place of Segol, on account of the Ḥatef Pathaḥ under the א), and הִזָּכֶרְכֶם Ez 21:29. Instances with Ḥolem instead of Ṣere also occur,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

e. g. הַנָּתוֹן Jr 38:3, הֶאָכוֹל Lv 19:7, הֵאָסֹף 2S 17:11 and הַאִדָּרֵשׁ Ez 14:3.[a]

g. The Nif'al occurs in two forms in the same sentence, viz. נִכְתָּב . . . נַחְתּוֹם Es 8:8. Similarly, with Ḥolem in the second radical, וְנַהֲפוֹךְ ibid 9:1 (this may also be a participle), וְנֵעְתּוֹר 1Chr 5:20, and נִמּוֹל Gn 17:26.[120]

h. The Nif'al participle is to be distinguished from the Perfect by the vowel under the second radical: in the Perfect it is Pathaḥ or Shewa,[b] while in the participle it is Ḳameṣ in all its inflections.[c] In the construct, this Ḳameṣ changes to Pathaḥ, e. g. וְנֶאֱמַן רוּחַ Pr 11:13, נִלְעַג לָשׁוֹן Is 33:19, נַעֲוַת הַמַּרְדּוּת 1S 20:30.[d]

j. The preformatives in this conjugation take Ḥireḳ, except א, which is mostly vocalized with Segol [see above § 22m]. Before a laryngeal, the vowel under the preforma-

a. In the last example the א is in place of ה for euphonic reasons, in order to avoid the concurrence of two similar letters.[119] According to Ḥayyuj [N. 55], however, the א is a first person preformative, the verb being in the Hithpa'el as is also the subsequent אֶדָּרֵשׁ.

b. Except in pause when the second radical takes a tone-bearing Ḳameṣ, while the Ḳameṣ of the participle is non-pausal. Instances with Ḳameṣ, even without pause, are also common, e. g. נִשְׁאָר Gn 42:38, נִפְרָד Ju 4:11, נִכְתָּב Es 8:8, נִזְהָר Ez 3:21, 33:5f., etc.

c. The forms נִטְמָאִים Ez 20:30, הַנִּמְצָאִים Es 1:5, נֶחְבָּאִים Jos 10:17 and הַנִּבָּאִים Jr 14:15, originate, according to Jacob ben El'azar, from a form with Ṣere under the second radical, on the analogy of מוֹפֵת—מוֹפְתִים and מוֹקֵשׁ—מוֹקְשִׁים etc.[121] So also the forms נֶאֱמָנֵי Ps 101:6, נִדָּחֵי Jr 49:36,[122] נִדָּח 2S 14:13, וְנִכְבְּדֵיהֶם Ps 149:8; while נִדָּחַי IS 16:4, נִקְבָּצָיו ibid 56:8, נִמְצָאֶיךָ ibid 22:3, are from the regular נִפְעָל. The Ḳameṣ under the second radical sometimes changes to Pathaḥ followed by a Dagesh, e. g. נִכְבַּדֵּי Pr 8:24 and Is 23:8. The form נִדַּחֲךָ Dt 30:4 may also belong to this category [with virtual doubling of the ח].

d. The stem is, accordingly, עות. Some, however, construe it as a fem. participle from עוה, on the strength of the preceding בֶּן, which is in the construct state.[123]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

tive Nun is changed to Segol or Pathaḥ, while that under the laryngeal is either Shewa or Ḥatef Segol, which changes to Segol before a Shewa, e. g. נֶעְכָּר Ps 39:3, נַחְבֵּאתָ Gn 31:27, נַעְתָּרוֹת Pr 27:6, נֶאֱחַז Gn 22:13, נֶעֶרְמוּ Ex 15:8.

k. In the Imperfect, Infinitive, and Imperative, the pre-laryngeal Ḥireḳ changes to Ṣere, whilst the Ṣere under the second radical changes to Segol at the recession of the tone, sometimes also to Pathaḥ, particularly before a laryngeal or in pause, e. g. וַיֵּאָסֶף Gn 25:8, תֵּעָזֵב Job 18:4, תֵּרָמַסְנָה Is 28:3, וַיִּגָּמַל Gn 21:8, etc.

l. *Rem.* 1. The form נְגֹאֲלוּ La 4:14, Is 59:3, is a combination of the Nif'al and Pu'al, the sense in these two instances being both reflexive and passive.[124] Similarly, וְנִכַּפֵּר Dt 21:8, וְנִוַּסְּרוּ Ez 23:48, and נִשְׁתָּוָה Pr 27:15, are, likewise, mixed forms, made up of both Nif'al and Hithpa'el.[125]

m. *Rem.* 2. The form וְנֵאשְׁאַר Ez 9:8 is regarded by some as Nif'al with pleonastic א [for וְנִשְׁאַר]. It is, however, more probably, a Ḳal form with both the regular preformative of the first person sing. א and the preformative of the first person pl. נ, to indicate plur. maiestatis, as in נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם Gn 1:26.[126]

§ 24. Pi'el and Pu'al

a. The characteristic feature in these conjugations is the Dagesh in the middle radical.[a] The Infinitive of the

a. This Dagesh, however, is often omitted, e. g. הֵתֶל בִּי Gn 31:7, הָתֵל Ex 8:25,[127] הַלְלוּיָהּ, הַלְלוּ, הַלְלוּהוּ and אֲהַלְלָה Ps 146:2, מְאַסְפָיו Is 62:9 (in some Mss. with Pathaḥ under the א,[128] while the Masoretes are divided: some read it with Ḳameṣ and Ga'ya מְאָסְפָיו, others with Ḳameṣ ḥatuf מְאָסְפָיו), הוּתַל ibid 44:20, יוּקָשִׁים Ecc 9:12, etc. In the case of middle laryngeals, particularly א and ר, the Dagesh is frequently

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Pi'el is קַטֵּל or קַטֶּל,[a] the Imperative קַטֵּל.[b] The Pu'al being exclusively passive in meaning, unlike the Nif'al which is also reflexive,[134] has no Imperative. In both the active and the passive participles of the Pi'el a Mem is prefixed,[c] in order to distinguish them from the Infinitive and the Imperative; since, if the participle were modeled after its equivalent in the Ḳal (פֹּעֵל), the latent quiescent after the tone-less Ḥolem [cf. above, notes 11 and 35], would not allow of Dagesh in the middle radical, which Dagesh is the distinctive characteristic of this conjugation.[136]

b. The Pi'el is either transitive or causative in meaning, while the Pu'al is the passive of the Pi'el. Frequently, however, the Pi'el, as well as the Hif'il, merely serve to intensify the idea of the Ḳal, e. g. גֹּרֵשׁ Ex 34:11 and אֲגָרְשֶׁנּוּ ibid 23:29.30, צָמַח Lv 13:37 and צִמֵּחַ Ez 16:7, אָדְמוּ La 4:7 and יַאְדִּימוּ Is 1:18.[137]

compensated by lengthening the preceding vowel, e. g. בֵּרֵךְ and בֵּרַךְ, מֵאֵן Nu 22:13; but also נִאֵץ Ps 10:3. In אֶחֱרוּ Ju 5:28, the Segol under the א is due to the effect of the Ḥatef Segol under the ח; so also יֶחֱמַתְנִי Ps 51:7 [cf. Ḥayyuj, N. 24].

a. It occurs also with suffixed הָ- in זַמְּרָה Ps 147:1, יַסְּרָה Lv 26:18, and with suffixed ת in בְּצַדֶּקְתֵּךְ Ez 16:52. To the category of קַטֵּל belong the forms רַפֵּא Ex 21:19, קַנֹּא 1K 19:10, יַסֹּר Ps 118:18, יִסּוֹר Jb 40:2 (according to some, but should rather be taken as a noun in the sense of (מוּסָר),[129] לִיסּוֹד 2Chr 31:7 (for לְיַסֵּד, but it may also be construed as an Infinitive of the Ḳal, like לִיסֹד Is 51:16, in which the Yod assimilated into the ס), בָּרוֹךְ Jos 24:10, and שָׁאוֹל 2S 20:18.[130] Some regard the last two instances as Infinitives of the Ḳal. Another form of the Infinitive is נִאֵץ 2S 12:14 and חִלֵּץ Lv 14:43.[131] The forms שִׁלֵּם Dt 32:35, חִבֵּל Pr 23:34, וְהַדִּבֵּר Jr 5:13, and דִּבֶּר Hos 1:2,[132] are substantives. וּבַשֵּׁל Ex 12:9 may also belong here [but see above § 17a and note 87].

b. Also פַּעֵל, e. g. פַּלַּג Ps 55:10, וְקָרַב Ez 37:17,[133] כַּתַּר Jb 36:2.

c. The forms וְשַׁבֵּחַ Ec 4:2, מָאֵן Ex 7:27, הַמֵּאֲנִים Jr 13:10, are adjectival, the latter being on the analogy of חָרֵשׁ > חֲרָשִׁים.[134]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

c. The second radical takes Ṣere or Pathaḥ. The latter is particularly common in verbs with middle or third laryngeal.[a] Before a Maḳḳef the Ṣere changes to Segol;[b] also without Maḳḳef in the verbs דִּבֶּר, כִּפֶּר, and כִּבֶּס, which, however, become in pause דִּבֵּר Jos 14:10 and כִּבֵּס 2S 19:25.

d. In the active participle the first radical takes Pathaḥ; in the passive participle, as in the Pu'al conjugation, Ḳibbuṣ.[c] The second radical takes Ṣere in the active,[d] and Ḳameṣ in the passive, participle, masc. sing.

e. Rem. 1. The form מְקֻנַּנְתְּ Jr 22:23 is a forma mixta, combining the passive participle of the Pi'el and the perfect of the Pu'al [cf., however, below § 26]. Ibn Janaḥ, however, construes it as a passive participle of the Pi'el, in which the Segol under the second Nun changed to Shewa, because of its close connection with the following word [but see below, note 160].

a. Similarly in the Imperfect, e. g. יְגַלַּח Is 7:20; in pause יְגַלָּח Lv 13:33 (but also תְּאַחַר Ps 70:6), תְּעַכַּסְנָה Is 3:16, תְּרַטַּשְׁנָה ibid 13:18; also, without pause, יְזַבַּח Ḥab 1:16.

b. Also in the Imperfect, Participle, Infinitive and Imperative, e. g. יְדַבֶּר־נָא Gn 44:18, מְאַמֶּץ־כֹּחַ Pr 24:5, לְדַבֶּר־לָךְ 2K 4:13 and דַּבֶּר־נָא Is 36:11; and generally upon the retraction of the tone, e. g. וַיְגָרֶשׁ Gn 3:24, etc. [cf. above § 9c].

c. Sometimes Ḳameṣ ḥatuf, e. g. מְאָדָּם Na 2:4 and in Pu'al שָׁדְּדָה ibid 3:7, כָּלּוּ Ps 72:20, כָּרַּת Ez 16:4 [on the Dagesh in the ר see above, note 58].

d. Before a Maḳḳef, or tone-bearing pronominal suffixes, this Ṣere changes to Segol, or, less usually, to Ḥireḳ, e. g. מְנַחֶמְכֶם Is 51:12, מְקַדִּשְׁכֶם Lv 21:8, וּמְאַסִּפְכֶם Is 52:12 and מְבַעִתֶּךָ 1S 16:15 [cf. above § 9c]. In the latter instance the Dagesh is either euphonic,[138] or it compensates for the missing third radical, the complete form being מְבַעִתְךָ.

f. *Rem.* 2. The form צִמְּתֻתוּנִי Ps 88:17 is probably a combination of the second and third persons, namely, צִמְּתֻוּנִי and צִמְּתֻנִי. The doubling of the ת may, however, be for the sake of emphasis,[139] as in אֲדַמְדָּם, יְרַקְרַק, etc.[140] As to כֻּלֹּה מְקַלְלוּנִי [in our text מְקַלְלַוְנִי] Jr 15:10, it is either composed of the forms מְקַלְלוֹ and מְקַלְלֵנִי, or of the stem קלל and קלה, in which case the ה of the latter stem changed to Waw, which is not uncommon.[141]

g. The vowel under the second radical in Pu'al Perfect is Pathaḥ, in pause and in the participle—Ḳameṣ, e. g. שֻׁלָּח Ob 1, לֻקָּח 2K 2:10, הַיּוּלָּד Ju 13:8.[142]

h. *Rem.* 1. The form עֻלְפֶּה Ez 31:15 [in our text עֻלְפֶּה] is in place of עֻלַּף, the tone-bearing ה ֶ being suffixed as in אִשֶּׁה Lv 2:11.16, צִחֵה Is 5:13 and תָּפְתֶּה Is 30:33.

i. *Rem.* 2. As to מוּעָדֶת Pr 25:19, Ibn Chiquitilla, quoted by Ibn Ezra [Ṣ. 43b], maintains that the Shureḳ is instead of Ḥolem, the form being participle Ḳal of the stem מעד.[143]

j. *Rem.* 3. Other peculiar forms which are identified with this conjugation are: הַיְחָבְרְךָ Ps 94:20 [for הַיְחֻבְּרְךָ], where the Ḳameṣ ḥatuf replaces the Ḳibbuṣ and the Dagesh is omitted;[144] מִנֹּאָץ Is 52:5, which is composed of the Hithpa'el and the Pu'al and has the meaning of both these conjugations;[145] נוּלְּדוּ 1Chr 20:8, which combines the Nif'al and Pu'al, according to some grammarians, but which may also be a Nif'al, wherein the latent quiescent of the Ḥolem is replaced by Dagesh in the ל [cf. below, note 214].

k. *Rem.* 4. Some verbs occurring in the Pu'al have no

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

corresponding Pi'el forms, e. g. אֻכָּל Ex 3:2, לֻקַּח Is 52:5, הַיּוּלָּד Ju 13:8 [the Pi'el of which does occur but hasn't the corresponding active meaning], etc. It is, however, legitimate to create Pi'el forms on the basis of these Pu'als. Thus we find חדים טִבַּעְתָּ and בתהמות טִבַּע in the liturgical formulae, on the basis of טֻבְּעוּ Ex 15:4, and, accordingly, we may build the Hif'il forms הִלְקִיחַ and הִנְתִּין [הִתִּין] as the actives of הֻיֻקַּח Is 49:24 and יֻתַּן Lv 11:38. Samuel ha-Nagid, however, regards these as passive of the Ḳal.[146]

§ 25. Hif'il and Hof'al

a. Both in the Hif'il and the Hof'al a ה is prefixed to the stem. In the Imperfect and the participle this characteristic ה is elided.[a] In the Hif'il third person Perfect, sing. and pl., the second radical takes long *ī* (ִי) and bears the tone.[b] In the second and first persons, the vowel under the second radical is Pathaḥ,[c] הִפְקַדְתָּ, etc. When the first radical is a laryngeal, the vowel under the preformative is Segol,[d] while that under the laryngeal is either Ḥatef Segol or Shewa, e. g. הֶאֱרִיכוּ Ps 129:3, הֶעְמִיקוּ Hos 5:2. With Waw consecutive the preformative takes Pathaḥ, e. g. וְהַעֲבַרְתָּ Lv 25:9, וְהַעֲמַדְתָּ Ez 29:7, etc.

b. The Hif'il is causative in meaning, with the Hof'al as its passive.

a. Except in some פ״י verbs, e. g. יְהוֹשִׁיעַ 1S 17:47, יְהֵילִילוּ Is 52:5, etc.; we also find מְהֻקְצָעוֹת Ez 46:22.

b. But וְהִבְדִּילָה Ex 26:33, וְהֵבִיאָה Lv 15:29, in which the tone is on the ultima.

c. Also Ḥireḳ, in הִשְׁאִלְתִּיהוּ 1S 1:28, in which case the Ḥireḳ may be attenuated from Ṣere, the verb being of the פָּעֵל formation.

d. Even before a non-laryngeal in הִכְלַמְנוּם 1S 25:7. The form הֶעֱבַרְתָּ Jos 7:7, is peculiar.[147]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

c. *Rem.* 1. In וְהֶאֱזְנִיחוּ Is 19:6, the א is considered pleonastic by some grammarians. Others maintain that the א is prosthetic as in Aramaic אִשְׁתִּיו Dan 5:3, while the ה is a regular Hif'il preformative.[148] In my opinion, however, the א is in place of ה as in אֶגְאָלְתִּי Is 63:3, אֶתְחַבַּר 2Chr 20:35, while the ה preceding it is extraneous.

d. *Rem.* 2. The Ḥatef Ḳameṣ under the ח in הֶחֳדַלְתִּי Ju 9:9.11.13 is regarded by grammarians as euphonic for Ḥatef Segol, like הֶעֳמַדְתִּי. This form may, however, be regarded as Perfect Hof'al, like הֶחֳלֵיתִי 1K 22:34, the Segol under the ה being in place of Ḳameṣ.[149]

e. *Rem.* 3. The prefixed ת in תִּרְגַּלְתִּי Hos 11:3, is, according to most of the grammarians, in place of ה, which is not uncommon, particularly in the ל״ה verbs.[150] However, at the beginning of the word, this interchange of ת and ה is unusual. The word may, therefore, be regarded, with my brother Moses, in his book *Taḥbosheth*, as a verbal noun on the analogy of תִּפְאַרְתִּי, in which case the tone ought to be on the ultima.

f. *Rem.* 4. וְהִשְׁלַכְתֶּנָה Am 4:3 is probably for וְהִשְׁלַכְתֶּן with pleonastic ה, as in קִרְבֶּנָה Gn 41:21, כִּסְּתוֹתֵיכֶנָה Ez 13:20, etc. It may also be a mixed form, combining the Perfect and Imperfect (וְהִשְׁלַכְתֶּן and תַּשְׁלַכְנָה).[151]

g. In both the active and passive participles of the Hif'il a Mem is prefixed to the stem, while the characteristic ה is elided. The vowel under the Mem is Pathaḥ in the active, and Ḳibbuṣ, or Ḳameṣ ḥatuf, in the passive participle. The second radical takes Ḥireḳ[a] in the active and Ḳameṣ

a. Also Ṣere, e. g. מוֹצָא Ps 135:7.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

in the passive participle, e. g. מַרְבִּיץ Is 54:11, מֻשְׁלָךְ 2S 20:21, מָשְׁזָר Ex 26:1.[152]

h. *Rem*. 1. The participles מַחְלְמִים Jr 29:8 and מַעְזְרִים 2Chr 28:23, are unusual for מַחְלִימִים and מַעֲזִירִים.[153] As to מַבְלִיגִיתִי Jr 8:18, some regard it as a conflation of the masculine מַבְלִיגִי and the feminine מַבְלַגְתִּי, in which the endings (ִי) are pronominal suffixes of the first person. It may, however, be construed, with my brother Moses, in his book *Taḥbosheth*, as a noun like מַרְבִּית 1S 2:33, which is in place of מַרְבִּיִּת.[154]

i. *Rem*. 2. The form מֳעֳמָד Ps 69:3, is taken by some grammarians as a noun like מָעֲרָב, the Ḳameṣ under the Mem being euphonic.[155] It may, however, be regarded as a passive participle of Hif'il, the reference being to the subject אֵבֶר "one of my limbs." In מִשְׁחַת Is 52:14 the Ḥireḳ under the מ is instead of Ḳameṣ ḥatuf [or Shureḳ as in וַיִּישֶׂם Gn 50:26 and יִיסָךְ Ex 30:32, see below § 36k).[156]

j. In the Imperative and the Infinitive the preformative ה takes Pathaḥ,[a] while the second radical takes Ḥireḳ or Ṣere,[b] e. g. לְהַשְׁלִיךְ Ec 3:5, וְהַשְׁלֵךְ Jr 36:23; in the Imperative plur. fem. the second radical has always Ṣere, הַפְקֵדְנָה. The characteristic ה is frequently elided, e. g.

a. Sometimes Ḥireḳ: וְהִמְלִיט Is 31:5, הִרְגִּיעַ Jr 50:34, הִרְגִּיז ibid, הִשְׁמִידָם Jos 11:14; also Segol: הֶחֱזִיקִי Jr 31:31, הֶאֱרִיךְ Pr 19:11.[157] To the same category are attributed by some grammarians [Joseph Ḳimḥi, *Ziḳ*. 35] the forms כְּהִנְדֹּף Ps 68:3 and כְּהִתּוּךְ Ez 22:22, while others [Ibn Janaḥ in *Riḳ*. 94 and *Shor*. s.v.] regard them as Nif'al formations in place of כְּהִנָּדֵף and כְּהִנָּתֵךְ. In my opinion, however, these are verbal nouns of the Hif'il formation.[158]

b. Also Pathaḥ: הַנְחַת Joel 4:11, הַיְשַׁר Ps 5:9, הַזְכַּרְכֶם Ez 21:29; in pause הַרְחַק Jb 13:21.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

וְלַנְפִּיל Nu 5:22, לַרְאוֹתְכֶם Dt 1:33, לְלַבֵּן Dn 11:35, לָבִיא 2Chr 31:10, לַעְשֵׂר Dt 26:12 and בַּעְשֵׂר Ne 10:39, etc. [on the last two forms see below, note 603].

k. In the Imperfect the characteristic ה is elided, except in some פ"י verbs, e. g. יְהוֹשִׁיעַ 1S 17:47, יְהֵילִילוּ Is 52:5, etc. The vowel under the second radical is Ḥireḳ, less frequently, Ṣere,[a] e. g. וְאַחֲזֵק Is 42:6, יַחֲזֵק ibid 27:5, and before a Maḳḳef וַיַּשְׁלֶךְ־שָׁם 2K 2:21, etc. There are, however, instances where the second radical takes Shewa, e. g. וַיַּדְבְּקוּ 1S 31:2, יַעְשְׁרֶנּוּ ibid 17:25, תַּעְשְׁרֶנָּה Ps 65:10 [cf. below § 35c and note 195].

§ 26. Po'el[159]

a. The Po'el conjugation, like the Pi'el, is either transitive or causative in meaning and has a Mem in the participle, e. g. יוֹדַעְתִּי 1S 21:3, וְיוֹלַדְתְּ Ju 13:5,[b] לִמְשׁוֹפְטִי Jb 9:15, מְלוֹשְׁנִי Ps 101:5. The Perfect occurs with Ṣere or Pathaḥ in the second radical, e. g. שֹׁרַשׁ Is 40:24, עוֹלַל L 1:12, in pause שׁוֹרָשׁוּ Jr 12:2.[c] The Imperfect is יְפוֹעֵל, etc.; with pronominal suffixes, תְּאָכְלֵהוּ Jb 20:26 [cf. above, notes 127 and 144]. The Infinitive is פּוֹעֵל, e. g. וּלְשׁוֹטֵט Jos 23:13. In the ע"ו verbs the third radical is doubled, while in the

a. Sometimes followed by Yod, e. g. וְתַגִּיד Ex 19:3, יַגִּיד Ec 10:20 [in our text יַגִּיד], etc.

b. In these last two instances the first is regarded by most grammarians as Hif'il, the Yod being a preformative in place of ה, the second as a composite of the Perfect and the participle of the Ḳal, like יוֹשַׁבְתְּ Jr 22:23 and מְקֻנַּנְתְּ ibid (the latter combining the forms מְקֻנֶּנֶת and קוֹנַנְתְּ) [cf. above § 24e].[160]

c. According to some grammarians שׁוֹפְטָה Ju 4:4 also belongs to this conjugation and is a Perfect. [Cf. above § 22t and note 112].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ע״ע verbs the Po'el occurs in full, with both the second and third radical, e.g. וַיְמֹדֵד Ḥab 3:6, on the analogy of יְפוֹעֵל.

§ 27. Hithpa'el

a. The Hithpa'el is connected both in form and in meaning with the Po'el (in the ע״ע, ע״ו and in a few other verbs), or the Pi'el. It is primarily the reflexive of these forms, e. g. וְהִתְבָּרְכוּ Gn 22:18. The reflexive sense, however, is not always apparent, e. g. הִתְהַלֶּךְ־נֹחַ Gn 6:9.[a] It sometimes also expresses the idea of pretending to be or to do that which is predicated by the stem, e. g. וְהִתְבָּרֵךְ Dt 29:18, מִמִּתְכַּבֵּד Pr 12:9, מִתְעַשֵּׁר ibid 13:7, מִתְרוֹשֵׁשׁ ibid, הִתְחָל 2S 13:5.

b. The distinctive features of the Hithpa'el are: (a) the preformative syllable הִתְ, which in the participle and Imperfect is shortened to ת;[161] and, as in the Pi'el, (b) a Dagesh in the second radical.[b] The vowel under the first radical is Pathaḥ, which changes to Ḳameṣ before a laryngeal.[c]

c. Before the letters דטת the preformative ת is dropped[d]

a. The sense being: he made himself worthy (by his good deeds) of walking with God.

b. See, however, וַיִּתְיַלְדוּ Nu 1:18, הֻדַּשְׁנָה Is 34:6 and הִתְפָּקְדוּ Nu 1:47 (the Hithpa'el of פָּקַד) [but see below, rem. 1]. In the latter instance the Dagesh is compensated by the lengthening of the preceding vowel to Ḳameṣ.

c. Before ה or ח the Pathaḥ is retained, e. g. וְהִטַּהֲרוּ Gn 35:2, לְהִתְנַחֵם ibid 37:35, but is changed to Segol in pause, because of the Ḳameṣ following it, e. g. וְהִטֶּהָרוּ Nu 8:7, וְיִתְנֶחָם ibid 23:19, תִּתְנֶחָלוּ ibid 33:54, etc. [Cf. also above § 9h].

d. So also וְתִנַּשֵּׂא Nu 24:7 [but this may be a נִפְעַל form; see above, note 125].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

and assimilated into the first radical, e. g. הִטַּהֲרְנוּ Jos 22:17 [in our text הִטַּהַרְנוּ], מִדַּבֵּר Nu 7:89, לַמִּטַּהֵר Lv 14:14, יִטַּמָּא Lv 21:1, etc. When the stem begins with one of the sibilants the ת and the sibilant change places,[a] e. g. וַיִּשְׁתַּמֵּר Mi 6:16, נִשְׁתָּוָה Pr 27:15. Under the influence of a preceding צ the characteristic ת changes to ט because of the resemblance in sound of the צ and the ת pointed with Dagesh,[163] e. g. נִצְטַדָּק Gn 44:16, while after the first radical ז, the ת changes to ד in Aramaic and in post-biblical Hebrew, e. g. הִזְדְּמִנְתּוּן Dn 2:9, נִזְדַּמֵּן and נִזְדַּכֵּךְ in talmudic Hebrew.[164] In biblical Hebrew, this ד is assimilated into the following letter, e. g. הִזַּכּוּ Is 1:16[b], in which case the Dagesh of the כ is both a Dagesh Compensativum and a characteristic of the Hithpa'el.[165] Instances of ד being assimilated are common in Aramaic, e. g. גַּפּוֹהִי in place of גַּדְפּוֹהִי, קַמּוֹהִי in place of קַדְמוֹהִי, and, according to my father [*Galui* 79] also in Hebrew, e. g. אֲגַפֶּיךָ Ez 38:9 instead of אֲגַדְפֶּיךָ, in Aramaic, "your wings," the א being prosthetic.

d. The second radical in the Perfect takes Ṣere,[c] or Pathaḥ, which changes to Ḳameṣ in pause, e. g. וְהִתְגַּלָּח Lv 13:33.

e. *Rem.* 1. The preformative הת is sometimes changed, on the analogy of Aramaic, to את, e. g. אֶתְחַבַּר 2Ch 20:35,

a. The ת retains its position in וְהִתְשׁוֹטַטְנָה Jr 49:3 in order to avoid the concurrence of ת with Dagesh and the ט, with which it is kindred in sound.[162]

b. The tone being on the ultima, this form cannot be regarded as Nif'al ע"ע, for in that event the tone would be on the penultima, as in הִבָּרוּ Is 52:11. It is, therefore, to be taken as Hithpa'el of ל"ה.

c. Hence, according to Jacob ben El'azar, the forms . . . וְהִתְגַּדִּלְתִּי וְהִתְקַדִּשְׁתִּי Ez 38:23, וְהִתְקַדִּשְׁתֶּם Lv. 11:44.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

אֶשְׁתּוֹלְלוּ Ps 76:6. The forms הָתְפָּקְדוּ 1K 20:27, הֻדַּשְּׁנָה Is 34:6, הֻטַּמָּאָה Dt 24:4, הֻכַּבֵּס Lv 13:55.56, are mixed forms, composed of both Hof'al and Hithpa'el.[166]

f. *Rem.* 2. As to the form יִרְדּוֹף Ps 7:6, some grammarians regard it as Hithpa'el. This view is, however, untenable, since the Hithpa'el is never transitive in meaning.[a] This form is, in my opinion, a combination of both the Ḳal and the Pi'el, the sense being both transitive and causative.[167]

a. The constructions וְהִתְנַחַלְתֶּם אוֹתָם Lev 25:46, and תִּתְחַטְּאוּ Nu 31:20 are not to be taken as transitive in meaning. In the first example אוֹתָם is in place of מֵהֶם, while in the second, the word עִם is implied.

NOTES: CHAPTER THREE B

[114] Ḳimḥi thus recognizes the reflexive value of the Nif'al, as he distinctly states it in the Hebrew text (Lyk ed. 21b). The severe criticism leveled against him by Efodi (*Ma'ase Efod* 57ff.) and Derenbourg (*Opusc.* XXXVII, note 2), for his "misconception" of the nature of the Nif'al, are, therefore, unjustified. Similarly, Kirchheim's remark (*Riḳma* 215) to the effect that the Nif'al is regarded by Ḳimḥi as the passive of the Ḳal only, is unfounded. Ḳimḥi evidently does realize the distinction between the relationship which the Nif'al bears to the Ḳal and that which the Pu'al and Hof'al bear to their respective actives, since he never applies the term שלא נזכר פועלו, used by the mediaeval Hebrew grammarians to denote the passives, to the Nif'al. In his love for brevity and simplicity, Ḳimḥi does not quibble, as do the more subtle Ibn Janaḥ and Efodi (*Riḳ.* 93 and *Ma'ase* Efod 57), about the active element in the reflexive. His living sense of the Hebrew language which often prompts him to advocate some degree of linguistic freedom, and innovating, as witness below, b and §§ 24k, 34g, and 81f, may have induced him here also to disregard the Pu'al as passive of the Ḳal (cf. below, note 146), as obsolete, and to adopt in its place the Nif'al, which was gradually gaining predominance already in the Bible, and particularly in later Hebrew, as passive of the Ḳal. The Nif'al, originally representing the reflexive or the middle voice, came to express later also the passive, because of the kinship in meaning existing among them, since they all imply the idea that the change or effect of the activity is centered upon the subject. An analogous phenomenon can be found in Latin, where the passive verbs, because of their semantic relationship with the middle verbs, or the so-called deponent verbs, have taken on the endings of the latter (see *The Psychology of Language*, Walter B. Pillsbury and Clarence L. Meader, 1928, D. Appleton and Co., 273).

[115] This is in contradiction to Ibn Janaḥ, who insists that the Nif'al is never derived from the "heavy" conjugations (*Riḳ.* 93 and *Shor.* 216). Ḳimḥi's is, however, the sounder view, which is also corroborated by analogous instances in other Semitic languages, cf. Brock. *GvG.* I, 536f. For a fuller list of examples in Hebrew see Ges.-Bergstrasser II, § 16d.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[116] This would imply that Ibn Janaḥ regards הַיּוֹתֵר as a participle, but in *Riḳ*. 61 he distinctly remarks in reference to this form that it is a noun and not a verb (שם לא פעל׳). I have not been able to locate in the available writings of Ibn Janaḥ the view attributed to him here by Ḳimḥi. It is, therefore, probably, Ḥayyuj, not Ibn Janaḥ, that Ḳimḥi has in mind in this connection. Ḥayyuj (N. 32, Jastrow 65) does form a Ḳal paradigm of יתר, and immediately after mentioning הַיּוֹתֵר distinctly states that the noun is יֶתֶר, from which it is to be inferred that הַיּוֹתֵר immediately preceding is construed by him as a verb or participle.

[117] So also Ibn Ezra (*Mos*. 54a) and, previously, Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Menaḥem* 65a).

[118] Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 242) construes these forms as Perfects in the sense of Imperatives. But according to some of the moderns, either the reading or the explanation of these forms is doubtful (Ges.-K. § 51o), while others see in them remains of the old Imperative type **Naḳtil* (Bauer-Leander 322).

[119] This is the opinion of Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc*. 110 and *Riḳ*. 44). So also the moderns (Koenig II, 464; Ges.-K. § 51k; Bauer-Leander 357), who, however, explain the substitution of א for ה as due, probably, to the influence of the subsequent אֶדְרֹשׁ.

[120] The Hebrew grammarians are wavering in their opinions in respect of the נִפְעוֹל forms. Thus, Ḳimḥi in *Shor*. s.v. חתם construes נַחְתּוֹם as a participle. This is also the opinion of Ibn Janaḥ in *Opusc*. 86, where he adduces in proof the preceding participial form נִכְתָּב, with which נַחְתּוֹם is to agree (so also Profiat Duran, *Ma'ase Efod* 112). But in *Shor*. 175 and in *Riḳ*. 93 Ibn Janaḥ admits the possibility of construing both these forms in the Perfect (cf. also Ḳimḥi, below § 37h). The forms נִמּוֹל, נֶהְפּוֹךְ and נֶעְתּוֹר are regarded by him as Perfect (*Riḳ*. l. c.) and נִשְׁאוֹל 1S 20:6, וְנִשְׁלוֹחַ Es 3:13—as Infinitive (cf. Ḳimḥi above, rem. 1). Ibn Chiquitilla takes נַחְתּוֹם and וְנַעְתּוֹר as Perfect (quoted in *Mos*. 53b); while according to Ibn Ezra, all such forms are to be regarded as Infinitives (ibid.). This is also the opinion of Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik*. 36). The anonymous author of the Hebrew grammar, published by Poznański, p. 13, consistently designates all these forms as Perfect Nif'al of the פָּעוֹל formation, which is "the regular Nif'al form of the ע״ו and ע״ע" (?), cf. below § 37h. The modern grammarians, however, recognize the existence of a נִקְטֹל formation of the Infin. absolute, which probably originated in early Semitic on the analogy of the Ḳal קָטֹל–קְטֹל, thus: *Naḳtâlu* (נִקְטֹל): *Náḳtala* (נִקְטַל) = *Ḳatâlu* (קָטֹל): *Kátala* (קָטַל); cf. Ges.-K. § 63c and Bauer-Leander 322. The form נִמּוֹל is regarded

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

by Ḥayyuj (N. 48), Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 93), and Ḳimḥi as Nif'al of נמל and not, with the modern grammarians, of מול.

[121] Ibn Janaḥ regards all such instances as "lightened" forms (see op. cit. 167 and above, note 73). But the correct explanation of these forms is probably that of Ges.-Bergstrasser I, § 15e; namely, that the א is preserved here only orthographically, the forms actually implied being נִטְמִים, נִמְצִים, נֶחְבִּים, נִבִּים—constructed on the analogy of the corresponding ל״ה forms; cf. the forms חֹטְאִים 1S 14:33, קֹרְאִים Ps 99:6, נִרְפְּאוּ Ez 47:8, the subsequent step being אֲחַטֶּנָּה Gn 31:39. That there exists a close relation between the ל״א and the ל״ה is obvious from numerous examples in the Bible and in later Hebrew; cf. Ges.-K. § 75 VI and below § 39a, h, and note 298.

[122] But נִדְחֵי Ps 147:2 and Is 11:12 is referred by Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 287), after Ḥayyuj (*Noviye Materiali*, ed. Kokowzoff, [Russian text], p. 31), to a singular נִדָּח, whilst Ḳimḥi (*Shor.* s.v. דחה) refers it to the stem דחה. So also Koenig II, 109; but see Ges.-K. § 20m.

[123] Both these opinions are quoted by Joseph Ḳimḥi in *Zik.* 61f, The latter is that generally accepted by the moderns (cf. Ges.-Buhl s.v.). According to the former, נַעֲוַת is in the masculine and serves to modify בֶּן.

[124] So also Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 82 and *Riḳ.* 93). In Ges.-K. § 51h this opinion is attributed to Koenig and Cheyne. Wright (*Comp. Grammar*, p. 224) is "inclined to regard it as a quasi-Nif'al formation from the Pi'el נֵאַל, Pu'al נֹאַל," of which he adduces similar examples from the vulgar Arabic of Egypt. This etymology is really implied in Ibn Janaḥ's explanation (loc. cit.).

[125] The possibility of taking these forms as נִתְפַּעֵל (a combination of Nif'al and Hithpa'el) was already suggested by Ḥayyuj (N. 21). The same view is held by Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 19 and *Riḳ.* 97) and Ibn Ezra (*Moz.* 20a and comment. ad Dt 21:8). Ibn Bal'am, however, (quoted by Derenbourg in *Opusc.*, Introduction XXXVIII) and Aron b. Joseph (כליל יופי 4a) regard them as irregular Nif'al forms. It is also possible that in the case of וְנִכַּפֵּר and וְנִוַּסְּרוּ we have further instances of a quasi-Nif'al formation from the Pi'el (see preceding note), or as a Nippa'el. The Ḥireḳ under the Nun in place of Shewa before an unaccented syllable (cf. נִגְאֲלוּ, נְסַבּוֹתִי, נְקוֹמֹתִי, etc.) can be explained, with Eitan (*JQR.*, N.S., XII, 25ff.), as due to the analogical influence of the ordinary Nif'al (cf. below, notes 166 and 248). See also Albright *JQR.*, N.S., XIII, 503ff.

[126] Modern grammarians regard it generally as a compound of two

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

different readings, namely, תָּשְׁאַר and נָאֶשָּׁאֵר (cf. Koenig I, 266f.). Ḥayyuj (*Noviye Mater.*, ed. Kokowzoff [text], p. 48) calls attention to the peculiarity of this form, in which the preformatives of both the plural and the singular of the first person occur; but he does not explain it. In his commentary ad h. l. Ḳimḥi construes it as a forma mixta, composed of Perfect Nif'al and Imperfect Ḳal.

[127] The moderns regard these forms, as well as הֵתַלְתָּ Ju 16:10.13.15, יְהָתֵלּוּ Jr 9:4, תְּהָתֵלּוּ Jb 13:9, and וַיְהָתֶּל 1K 8:27 (with compensatory sharpening of the ת) as Hif'il of חלל, with the characteristic ה retained, as in יְהוֹשִׁיעַ 1S 17:47, יְהֵילִילוּ Is 52:5, etc. In referring all these forms to the stem התל Ḳimḥi follows Ḥayyuj (N. 13) and Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 124f.). The nominal forms הֲתֻלִים Jb 17:2 and מַהֲתַלּוֹת Is 30:10, as well as the fact that the Hif'il characteristic ה is retained only in verbs פ"י (excepting מְהֻקְצָעוֹת Ez 46:22), seem to point in favor of the etymology of the mediaeval grammarians. Stade § 145e recognized these difficulties, and he derives the nominal forms, as well as וַיְהָתֶּל from a secondary stem התל, which evolved from the Hif'il הֵחֵל by false etymology; while in יְהָתֵלּוּ, תְּהָתֵלּוּ the reading really intended by the consonantal text is, according to him, יְהַתֵּלּוּ, תְּהַתֵּלּוּ. It is, however, possible to construe the forms יְהָתֵלּוּ and תְּהָתֵלּוּ (with euphonic or pausal Dagesh, cf. above § 16a and note 84), as remains of an original Imperfect of the Ḳal יְקָטֵל (from the ground-form *yaḳatilu*), the normal form of the Ḳal in Ethiopic (cf. Wright, *Comp. Grammar* 180f.), the stem being התל. We shall thus have the equation *Ḳattala*: *Yeḳattel* (*Pi'el*) = *Ḳātala*: *Yeḳātel* (*Ḳal*). To the same category may also belong the following: יְחָבְרְךָ Ps 94:20 (for יְחַבֶּרְךָ, see below, note 144), תְּאָכְלֵהוּ Jb 20:26, תָּעָבְדֵם and נָעָבְדֵם Ex 20:5, 23:24, Dt 5:9, 13:3 (for תְּעָבְדֵם and נַעֲבְדֵם), and, perhaps, תְּרָצְּחוּ (for תְּרַצְּחוּ). The omission or dropping of the Metheg under the second radical in these instances may be due to a misunderstanding by the masoretes of the etymology of these forms, since they made no qualitative distinction between Ḳameṣ and Ḳameṣ ḥatuf (see above, note 14); while the change of the Shewa to Ḳameṣ in תָּעָבְדֵם and נָעָבְדֵם is in consonance with the principles relative to the pronunciation of the Shewa discussed above, §4b. As to הֵתֵל and הֵתַלְתָּ, they may be referred, with Ben Yehuda s.v. התל, to a primitive Ḳitil conjugation, which is still extant in vulgar Arabic, perhaps also in early literary Arabic, and in the cognate languages (cf. Brock. *GvG.* I, 506). These forms may also have arisen, by false etymology, from the Imperfect (cf. בֵּרֵךְ—יְבָרְכוּ). Ben Yehuda (loc. cit.) explains the form יְהָתֵלּוּ, etc. as Imperfect of קָאטַל (*Ḳātal*), in which the originally long *ā* is

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

changed to Ḳameṣ as in Aramaic and not to Ḥolem as in Hebrew. This is, however, unnecessary.

[128] This reading is found in Codex Hileli, cf. Baer, Liber Jesaiae, p. 81. This form may, then, be referred to the Po'el conjugation, in which the originally long *ā* (*Ḳātala*) changed to Ḳameṣ as in Aramaic and not to Ḥolem, according to the Hebrew method.

[129] The opinion preferred by Ḳimḥi is quoted in his *Shor*. s.v. from his father. But it was already previously suggested by Ibn Janaḥ (cf. *Riḳ*. 51, note 1 and *Luma'* 97) and adopted by Ibn Ezra (commentary ad h. l.). Modern grammarians, likewise, construe this form as a substantive or adjective, on the analogy of גִּבּוֹר and שִׁכּוֹר, in the sense of "fault-finder" or "critic" (cf. Koenig II, 148 and Bauer-Leander 479). An alternative explanation is, however, given by Ibn Janaḥ, probably after Ḥayyuj (N. 27), according to which it is to be taken as an Infinitive Pi'el (op. cit. and *Opusc.* 311). He adduces in support of this view the analogy of לִיסּוֹד 2Chr 31:7, which he apparently reads with Ben Asher (which reading is also accepted by Baer), לְיַסּוֹד, and not with Ben Naftali, לִיסּוֹד (cf. below § 36g and Ges.-K. § 69n).

[130] So Ibn Janaḥ (Shor. 79) and most of the modern grammarians (cf. Ges.-B. s.v.). Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik*. 34) prefers to construe it as Ḳal, although they are followed by Pi'el verbs (cf. below § 78b).

[131] So Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 51) and most of the modern grammarians (cf Koenig I, 247 and Barth *Nb* § 49b).

[132] With regard to this example Ḳimḥi is wrongly quoted by Ges.-K. § 52o as construing it in the Infinitive.

[133] So Ḥayyuj (*Noviye Mater*., ed. Kokowzoff, [text], 202) and Ibn Janaḥ (cf. *Shor*. 456); cf. also Koenig I, 190. This seems to be the regular form in Bab. in the case of verbs med. laryng. and ע״ר (cf. Kahle quoted by Bauer-Leander 358). The Pathaḥ in פַּלֵּג is "probably an intentional imitation of the preceding בַּלַּע" (Ges.-K. § 52n).

[134] This may be adduced as further proof that Ḳimḥi did not overlook the reflexive characteristic of the Nif'al (see above, note 114).

[135] So also Ibn Janaḥ in *Riḳ*. 59 and 60, but ibid. 88 he regards them as Pi'el participles with the prefix Mem omitted. The latter is the opinion generally held by the moderns (cf. Barton on Ec. 4:2, Ges.-K. § 52s, Bauer-Leander 217 and 356). Cf., however, Barth *Nb*. 273.

[136] This explanation of the prefix מ, common to the participial forms in all the subsequent conjugations, is rather artificial. The correct explanation is probably that the participles, being nominal in character,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

share with the nouns this characteristic prefix, see below § 58. The origin of this prefix is probably to be looked for in the region of interrogative or indefinite pronouns (מִי and מָה); cf. Ges.-K. § 85e and Bauer-Leander § 45t.

[137] More on the meanings and uses of the Pi'el is to be found in Ibn Ezra (Bacher's *Ibn Esra* etc., p. 101f.).

[138] The form should be according to this, מְבַעֶתְךָ, with the subject רוּחַ employed in the masculine, as in הוֹלֵךְ הָרוּחַ ... שָׁב הָרוּחַ Ec 1:6. This is the opinion held by Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 143), who, however, regards the Dagesh as pausal (see above § 16a and note 84). The second etymology of Ḳimḥi is, however, that generally accepted by the moderns, namely, that the form arose from מְבַעַת (cf. מְשָׁרֵת) which was developed into מְבַעֲתַת (cf. Ges.-K. § 80d and Bauer-Leander 614).

[139] The regular form should then be according to the latter opinion צִמְּתוּנִי. The former view, viz. that it be taken as a forma mixta, is advanced by Ḥayyuj (N. 25) and is accepted by Abraham de Balmis, *Miḳne Abraham*, p. 201, and by Koenig I, 203.

[140] That the duplication is intended for emphasis is also maintained in the Mishna, Nega'im XI, 4, and in Sifra to Lv 13:49. On the other hand, אֲדַמְדָּם is illustrated by Akiba (Nega'im 1:2) by כיין המזוג במים; while הַמְצַפְצְפִים Is 8:19 is construed in b. Sota 12b as צופין ואינם יודעים מה צופין (from the stem צפה). Similarly, Saadia speaks with regard to יְרַקְרַק Lv 13:14 as שֶׁהוּכְפַּל לְקוֹשִׁי (cf. Ibn Ezra, *Sefath Yether* 22). But Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Saadia* 11f. and *ag. Menaḥem* 15), Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. s.v. עוף), Ibn Ezra (cf. references in Bacher's *Ibn Esra* etc. 82, note 12), Parḥon (*'Aruk* s.v. עוף), all consider the duplication as weakening. Ibn Ezra, however, makes a distinction between instances with the second and third radicals doubled, as in the present examples, and between those in which the first and second radicals are doubled, as in יָפְיָפִיתָ Ps 45:3, תְּשַׂגְשֵׂגִי Is 17:11, and קְלֹקֵל Nu 21:5. In the latter case, Ibn Ezra concedes that the duplication indicates intensification (comm. to Ps 45:3). Cf. also Barth *Nb*. § 146 and Zlotnik, *ha-Safah*, 1912, 138ff. Reduplication as indicative of such concepts as distribution, plurality, added intensity, increase in size, etc. is a prevalent and common linguistic phenomenon; cf. Sapir, Edward, *Language*, 1921, p. 79f.; also below, note 589.

[141] Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc*. 163f. and *Riḳ*. 24) regards the Waw in this instance as expletive, intended to lend intensity to the sense of the verb. But the moderns suggest the reading כֻּלְּהֶם קִלְלוּנִי (cf. Ges.-K. § 61h and Ges.-Buhl s.v.). In his commentary ad l. Ḳimḥi interprets this

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

word in consonance with his second etymology; namely, in the combined sense of "curse" (קלל) and "disgrace" (קלה). According to his first etymology, given here, מְקַלְלוֹ is probably meant to refer to God in the accusative.

[142] According to Ḥayyuj (N. 17, s.v. אכל), the פָּעֻל forms אֻכָּל Ex 3:2, לֻקָּח 2K 2:10, מוּעָדֶת Pr 25:19, יוּקָשִׁים Ec 9:2, are all in place of פָּעוּל. Ibn Janaḥ corroborates this view by citing also הַיּוּלָּד Ju 13:8 and other examples (*Riḳ*. 189 and *Opusc*. 15f.), but see below, note 442. The author of the anonymous Hebrew grammar, ed. Poznański, p. 9, includes in the same category also the form הוּתַל Is 44:20. Samuel ha-Nagid takes issue with Ibn Janaḥ on הַיּוּלָּד and construes it as a prophetic Perfect (cf. Ibn Ezra, *Ṣ*. 43b and Tanḥum Yerushalmi, quoted by Derenbourg in *Opusc*. XL). In *Moz*., however, p. 23b, Ibn Ezra criticizes the Nagid for construing this form as Imperfect (for הַיִּיוּלַּד), with the assimilation of one Yod, since the Imperfect never occurs with the definite article. See on these forms also below § 51a. As to the form מְקֻטָּל Ḳimḥi follows Ibn Ezra (*Moz*. 47b) in regarding it as a passive participle of the Pi'el; while according to Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 92f.) it may be taken either as passive participle of the Pi'el, or as participle of the Pu'al. The latter is the arrangement adopted by the modern grammarians, according to whom the פֻּעָל forms are either nouns, or Pu'al participles with מְ omitted; cf. Ges.-K. § 52s. See also the following notes and below, notes 146 and 152.

[143] Cf., however, the preceding note. Ewald § 169d, note, distinctly rejects the possibility of the change of Ḥolem to Shureḳ in the active participle Ḳal. He, therefore, prefers to take it as passive Pi'el participle with the מְ omitted. Cf. also Koenig I, 269f.

[144] This is the opinion of Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 168) and, among the modern grammarians, of Ges. (*Lgb*. 251), Olsh. § 250b and Koenig I, 257. Ewald § 71 construes it as an instance of metathesis (for יְחָבֶרְךָ), so also Ges.-K. § 60b, like יְחָנְךָ Gn 43:29 (for יְחָנְּךָ, see below § 38h), but see Koenig's objections to this view. The most plausible explanation is, perhaps, that advanced by Parḥon (*'Aruk* 6c); namely, that it is a Po'el formation (for יְחוֹבֶרְךָ), in which the long Ḥolem (originally long *ā*) may have changed (although irregularly, but cf. שָׁלֹשׁ, גְּדָל־, טְהָר־) to Ḳameṣ ḥatuf as in תְּאָכְלֵהוּ Jb 20:26 and מְלָשְׁנִי Ps 101:5 (from תְּאוֹכֵל and מְלוֹשֵׁן, see below § 35f). It is also possible to take it as another instance of the Imperfect form יְקֻטַּל (for יְחֻבַּרְךָ, see above, note 127).

[145] So also Ges.-K. § 55b. Ibn Janaḥ (Shor. 279) construes it as Hithpo'el, a quasi-Hithpa'el of the Po'el conjugation; cf. above, notes

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

124, 125, and below, note 166; while Ḥayyuj (N. 55) regards it as Hithpa'el, with the assimilation of the ת into the Nun. According to Luzzatto ad l. the original reading was here מְנֹאָץ which might be interpreted, like its converse מְבֹרָךְ (worthy of blessing), in the sense of "worthy of blasphemy." The founders of the vowel-system wanted to prevent such an interpretation by resorting to a grammatical device, and they, therefore, changed it to read מְנוֹאָץ.

[146] See *Moz.* 33a, where Samuel ha-Nagid is quoted by Ibn Ezra with regard to יֻקַּח and יֻתַּן. Ibn Janaḥ, however, regards these as passives of the Hif'il (*Opusc.* 35f. and *Shor.* 328). Consequently, a serious controversy resulted between the Nagid and Ibn Janaḥ, which is recorded by Ibn Barun in *Kitab al-Muwazana*, ed. Kokowzoff, p. 12. But the forms גֻּשַּׁשׁ and עֻזַּב Is 32:14, וְלֻקַּח Jr 29:22, זֻנָּה Ez 16:34, רֻאוּ Jb 33:21, יֻלַּד Gn 46:27, etc., the Pi'el of which either does not occur or has a different meaning, are construed by Ibn Janaḥ as passives of the Ḳal (*Opusc.* 33ff. and 260, and *Riḳ.* 92). Moses ibn Chiquitilla, according to Ibn Ezra (*Ṣ.* 68b), likewise, takes the form לֻקַּח Is 52:5 and all such forms, the Ḳal of which is transitive in meaning, as passive Ḳal. Ibn Ezra himself, however, disagrees with both the Nagid and Ibn Chiquitilla and refers these forms to the respective "heavy" conjugations (Pi'el and Hif'il); see references to Ibn Ezra in Bacher's *Ibn Esra* etc., p. 94 and quotations from *Yesod*, ibid., p. 152. This theory of the existence of a passive Ḳal in Hebrew was revived and systematically elaborated in modern times, independently of the older Hebrew grammarians, by Boettcher § 904ff. and § 1022, and particularly by Barth ("Das passive Qal und seine Participien" in the *Festschrift zum Jubiläum Hildesheimer*, Berlin 1890, pp. 145ff.).

[147] The Ṣere under the ה in this instance and in הֵעֲלָה Ḥab 1:15 is to be traced, according to Pinsker (*Mabo* 105), to the influence of the Babylonian system of vocalization, which preceded the Tiberian system and left its marks on it (cf. ibid. and 116f.). It is, however, possible that in these two examples, the retention of the normal vowel of the Hif'il characteristic (i. e. Ḥireḳ, lengthened to Ṣere because of its being in an open unaccented syllable) is due to the loose connexion of this vowel with the subsequent laryngeal. Compare also הֶאֱרוּ, פָּעֳלוֹ (see below 47c[1]), הֹעֲלָה Ju 6:28, הֹעֲלָתָה Na 2:8, etc.

[148] The former is the opinion of Menaḥem (*Maḥ.* s.v. זנח), the latter is that offered by Ibn Janaḥ (Shor. 135), according to which this is a forma mixta, combining the Aramaic אַזְנִיחוּ and the Hebrew הִזְנִיחוּ. The explanation advanced here by Ḳimḥi can also be inferred from Ibn

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Janaḥ's statement (ibid.), and is accepted by some of the modern grammarians (Ges. Ḳ. § 53p). In his *Lgb.*, p. 463, Ges. suggests the possibility of deriving it from an adjective אֶזְנָח. This etymology is definitely adopted by Ewald § 126b and § 162b. Others take it merely as a scribal error for וְהִזְנִיחוּ (see Koenig I, 293f.).

[149] Both these views are mentioned by Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ* 220f.). Ibn Janaḥ, however, favors the former (ibid. and *Shor*. 193), which was also accepted by Ewald § 51c and by Moore in Haupt's Bible. The opinion preferred by Ḳimḥi is adopted by Olsh. § 89, Stade § 175a and Koenig I, 240ff. In both events the interrogative particle is probably omitted (but see Koenig, ibid. 242). According to Abraham de Balmis, quoted by Koenig (*op. cit.* 241), this is a Ḳal form with ה interrogativum. This view, which was also held by Mühlau-Volk, is rejected by Koenig.

[150] This is the view held by Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 39 and 199, also *Shor*. 468), who adduces the analogous case of וּתְפוֹצוֹתִיכֶם Jr 25:35 for וַהֲפִיצוֹתִיכֶם (but see below § 37p and Ḳimḥi's *Shor* s.v. פוץ). Modern grammarians take it as a Taf'el form like the Aramaic תַּרְגֵּם, etc. This etymology was already suggested by Yefeth b. Ali in his commentary ad 1. (cf. Hirschfeld, *Hebrew Grammarians and Lexicographers*, p. 34), who construes it as a denominative of רֶגֶל; but see Barth, *Nb*. 279.

[151] This may also be a case of dittography, according to Ges.-K. § 44k, since the following word begins with ה (הַהַרְמוֹנָה).

[152] According to Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 92) the form מֻקְטָל may be regarded either as a passive participle of the Hif'il or as participle of the Hof'al. Cf. also above, note 142, with regard to מְקֻטָּל. Ibn Ezra, however, is more consistent and logical in this respect, since he definitely states (*Moz*. 47b and *Ṣ*. 43b) that the passive conjugations can have neither active nor passive participles. Ḳimḥi apparently adopts Ibn Ezra's view, although he does construct a hypothetical participle, הֻקְטָל, probably modeled after the participle of the Pu'al (cf. above § 24g). The moderns regard both מְקֻטָּל and מָקְטָל as participles of the Pu'al and Hof'al, respectively, but מֻקְטָל corresponds closely to the pass. participle of the 4th conjugation in Arabic (Hebrew Hif'il).

[153] In *Riḳ*. 71 Ibn Janaḥ construes these forms as adjectival nouns of the מַפְעָל formation. In *Shor*., however, he suggests that מַחֲלָמִים may also be taken as a Hif'il participle. Cf. also Ges.-K. § 53o.

[154] This is the opinion adopted by some of the modern grammarians (Olsh. 218 and Ges.-Buhl s.v.). According to Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 65) it is composed of the masculine מַבְלִינִי and the feminine מַבְלִינְתִּי, in

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

which the affixes ִי- are analogous to those in הַיֹּשְׁבִי Ps 123:1 and אֹהַבְתִּי Hos 10:11 (see above § 22su). Cf. also Ben Yehuda s.v.

[155] So Ibn Janaḥ in *Riḳ*. 101. But in *Opusc*. 309 he takes it as a noun of the מַקְטָל formation, like מָשְׁחָת Lv 22:25, מוּעָף Is 8:23, etc. The second explanation of this form offered by Ḳimḥi is found in Ḥayyuj (N. 16).

[156] On the interchange of Shureḳ, Ḳibbuṣ or Ḳameṣ ḥatuf, and Ḥireḳ, see Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 51 and *Opusc*. 32) and above, notes 16 and 93.

[157] These forms were regarded as Infinitives also by Ḥayyuj (cf. Kokowzoff's *Noviye Materiali* [Russian text] p. 39f.). So also the moderns (cf. Ges.-K. § 53l and Bauer-Leander 346). Ibn Janaḥ explains them on the principle of interchange of Perfect and Infinitive, in support of which he adduces also other examples (cf. *Riḳ*. 190).

[158] Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 288) construes this peculiar form as Nif'al Infinitive for הִנָּדוֹף, cf. הִנָּתוֹן Jr 38:3. He adduces the analogous examples of הִדּוֹשׁ Is 25:10, הִמּוֹל Gn 34:15, and הִתּוּךְ Ez 22:22, and criticizes Ḥayyuj (N. 48) for rejecting this possibility. But in Kokowzoff's *Noviye Materiali* [text] p. 22, Ḥayyuj clearly takes the forms הִמּוֹל, הִדּוֹשׁ, and הִנָּדוֹף as Nif'al Infinitives. Joseph Ḳimḥi, however, regards הִנְדּוֹף as Infinitive of the Hif'il. In any event, the peculiarity of this form may be due to assonance, under the effect of the following תִּנְדּוֹף. Modern grammarians generally add nothing to the clarification of this form, except some hair-splitting quibbles (cf. Koenig I, 306f.).

[159] The Po'el is recognized as a distinct conjugation by Ḥayyuj (N. 24, s.v. ידע and 26, s.v. ילד), Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 79) and Parḥon (*'Aruk* 3a). Ibn Janaḥ refers to this conjugation also the forms זֹרְמוּ Ps 77:18 and בּוֹשַׁסְכֶם Am 5:11. Ibn Ezra, however, is inconsistent in his treatment of this conjugation (cf. contradictory statements in *Moz*. pp. 4a and 53a, and in *Ṣ*. 49a). Solomon Ibn Yaḥya (14th century) rejects the Po'el entirely as a separate conjugation in the strong verbs (cf. לְשׁוֹן לִמּוּדִים, pp. 21 and 26). So also Elias Levita (adnot. to *Mikhlol*, ed. Lyk, p. 67b, also *Sefer ha-Harkaba*, pp. 20b and 32b) and Abraham de Balmis (*Miḳne Abraham*, p. 172). Among the modern grammarians Ewald § 125a is particularly clear and emphatic in assigning to this conjugation, on the basis of Arabic (form III) and Ethiopic, a distinct place and significance; and he includes in this category also the forms עוֹיֵן 1S 18:9, יְסֹעֵר Hos 13:3 and הֹרוֹ וְהֹגוֹ Is 59:13. The same opinion is held by Olsh. § 254, Ges.-K. § 55 and others. See, however, Koenig's objections, *Lgb*. I, 201f.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[160] Both views are given by Ḥayyuj (N. 24f.). According to Pinsker, however, יוֹלֶדְתְּ, etc. represent a more original type of the participle, out of which the usual forms יוֹלֶדֶת, יוֹשֶׁבֶת and מְקֻנֶּנֶת evolved (cf. *Mabo* 102f.). So also Olsh. §§ 68g and 109a. But Koenig I, 404ff. adopts Ḳimḥi's etymology; cf. also Ges.-K. § 90n.

[161] According to Ibn Chiquitilla, quoted by Ibn Ezra (*Yesod* 31f.), the ת alone is the characteristic of the Hithpa'el, while the ה is merely prosthetic, in order to support the silent Shewa under the ת, as it is also prefixed in the Nif'al Infinitive, to sustain the Dagesh in the first radical. He was probably led to this view by the corresponding Arabic forms *taḳattala* and *taḳātala*. This view is corroborated also by the equivalent forms in the other Semitic languages (cf. Brock. *GvG.* I, 528ff.).

[162] This explanation is first advanced by the disciples of Menaḥem (*Tesh.* 38) and is given also by Ḥayyuj (N. 29 s.v. יצב), Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 137), Ibn Ezra (*Ṣ.* 67a) and Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik.* 3f.). See also the anonymous Hebrew grammar, published by Poznański, p. 15f.

[163] The change is thus intended, according to Ḳimḥi, to prevent the assimilation of one letter into another. A somewhat different explanation is offered by the disciples of Menaḥem (op. cit. 38f.) and Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 135 and *Riḳ.* 96), according to which the change is in order to prevent the pronunciation of the צ like ס before a ת. Cf. also the anonymous Hebrew grammar, published by Poznański, p. 16.

[164] Cf. on this change the explanations on phonetic grounds given by the disciples of Menaḥem (op. cit. 40f.)and by Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 136), who adduce also examples from Arabic.

[165] This form is elaborately discussed by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit., pp. 129–41). Ḳimḥi accepts the opinion of Ibn Janaḥ in regarding הִזַּכּוּ for הִזְדַּכּוּ, with the assimilation of the ד into the ז. This view is also held by Ibn Chiquitilla (adnot. to Ḥayyuj, N. 75, s.v. זכה). Ibn Ezra, however, seems to be of the opinion that the ת of the Hithpa'el characteristic הת, is here assimilated into the ז (Bacher's *Ibn Esra* etc. 58–9, n. 8). The latter opinion is also accepted by Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik.* 3). The instances adduced below by Ḳimḥi to prove the assimilation of the ד, including that of אֲנַפֵּיךְ, which is the view that he attributes to his father, are cited by Ibn Chiquitilla (op. cit.). Modern grammarians are generally in favor of the view held by Ibn Ezra and Joseph Ḳimḥi relative to the explanation of the form הִזַּכּוּ (see Koenig I, 345 and 534; also Ges.-K. § 54d).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[166] According to Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 124, also *Riḳ*. 96 and 201) these forms are instances of the passive of Hithpa'el. Ibn Ezra (Bacher's *Ibn Esra* etc. 116, note 9) differs with Ibn Janaḥ in respect of הֻדַּשְּׁנָה. Ibn Janaḥ's opinion is generally adopted by the modern grammarians (cf. Ew. § 132; Koenig I, 199; Ges.-K. § 54h, etc.). Eitan (*JQR*, N.S., XII, 25ff.) attempts to construe the last three forms as passives of נִפְעַל (see above, note 125), but see Distenfeld's criticism (*JQR*, N.S., XIII, 341). It is, however, possible to take these forms as quasi-Hof'al of the Intensive stem (cf. above, notes 124 and 125, also below, notes 284 and 293), the correct reading of הֻדַּשְּׁנָה being הֻדְּשְּׁנָה. The Ḳibbuṣ in the antepretonic syllable is in place of Ḥatef Pathaḥ (cf. וְהֻפִּתִּיתָ Pr 24:28 and below, note 293), probably under the analogical influence of the reg. הֻפְעַל.

[167] The opinion rejected by Ḳimḥi with regard to יִרַדֹּף is that of Ḥayyuj (N. 55) and Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 471). Ḳimḥi's explanation is preferred by Ges.-K. § 63n. See also other explanations mentioned by Koenig I, 160.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

C. STRONG VERBS WITH PRONOMINAL SUFFIXES

§ 28. In General

a. The accusative of the personal pronouns, when the person or thing referred to by the active verb is known or previously mentioned, is usually expressed by pronominal suffixes appended to the verb. This form is not, however, employed in the reflexive sense.[168]

§ 29. The Pronominal Suffixes

a. The suffixes are the following:

	A To a form ending in a vowel	B To a form in the perfect ending in a consonant.	C To a form in the Impf. ending in a consonant
Sing. 1. com.	־ני	־ני (in pause ־ני)[a]*	
2. m.	־ך	־ך (in pause ־ך, also ־ך)[b]	
f.	־ך	־ך, ־ך, rarely ־ך[c]	־כי, ..
3. m.	־הו, ו[d]	־הו ו (ה׳)	־הו
f.	־ה	־ה[e]	־ה
ur.Pl 1. com.	־נו	־נו	־נו
2. m.	כם		כם
f.	כן		
3. m.	הם, ם	־ם[f] (from ־הם)	־ם ־ם
poet.	־מו	־מו	־מו
f.	־ן	־ן, ־ן	

* [On the meaning of these designations see above, p. 47, footnote].

Digitized by Google — Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

b. Under the influence of the suffixes, the tone is generally shifting forward toward the end of the word, and certain vowel-changes, particularly in the Perfect Ḳal are accordingly effected: (a) The Ḳameṣ in the first syllable [when antepretonic] changes to Shewa. (b) The Pathaḥ in the second syllable, when open, changes to Ḳameṣ. The Ṣere, however, of the פָּעֵל formations is retained, e. g. וּשְׂנֵאָהּ Dt 22:13, יְרֵאוּהוּ Job 37:24, etc.[168a] The Holem of the יְכֹל type is changed to a Ḳameṣ ḥatuf when occurring in a closed pretonic syllable, e. g. יְכָלְתִּיו Ps 13:5.

c. a].* Also without pause: רִמִּיתָנִי 1S 28:12, עָנָנִי Ps 118:5. Cf. also וְיִסְּרֵנִי Is 8:11.

d. b]. The reason for this Ḳameṣ is to avoid confusing it with the feminine suffix ךְ‍ֵ. Cf. צִוָּךְ Dt 6:17, פֵּאֲרָךְ Is 55:5, חָנְךָ Ps 53:6, etc. [168b]

e. c]. But אוֹתָךְ, עִמָּךְ, בָּךְ, לָךְ and אִתָּךְ for both the feminine and the masculine, except מֵאִתֵּךְ Is 54:10.

f. d]. Also ‍ָיו, פְּקַדְתִּיו by absorption of the ה; it occurs sometimes with Ḥireḳ in place of Pathaḥ under the second radical, e. g. שְׁאִלְתִּיהוּ Ju 13:6, יְלִדְתִּיהוּ Nu 11:12.

g. e]. This is weakened to ‍ֶה when preceded by נ or ת with Dagesh, e. g. צִוָּתָּה Ru 3:6, וְכִעֲסַתָּה 1S 1:6, חִלְּקַתָּה Is 34:17, שִׁכְּלַתָּה Ez 14:15, שְׁמָעֶנָּה Jb 5:27, etc., in which case the tone is on the penultima. Compare also Ex 2:3, Am 1:11, Jr 44:19, etc. [see further examples in the original Hebrew text, ed. Lyk, 26b and 27a].

h. f]. In וּבְצַעַם Am 9:1, the Pathaḥ may be due to the retraction of the tone.[169]

* [On the meaning of these designations see above, p. 47, footnote].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

C. STRONG VERB

	Suffix 1 Sing.	2 Sing. m.	2 Sing. f.	3 Sing. m.
Perf. Ḳal 3. m.	קְטָלַנִי שְׁכֵחַנִי [a] Is 49:14	קְטָלְךָ שְׁאֵלְךָ Gn 32:18	קְטָלֵךְ שְׁאֵלֵךְ	קְטָלָהוּ קְטָלוֹ אֲהֵבוֹ
3. f.	קְטָלַתְנִי קְטָלֶתְנִי	קְטָלַתְךָ קְטָלֶתְךָ	קְטָלַתֶךְ	[b]קְטָלַתְהוּ קְטָלַתּוּ קְטָלֶתְהוּ but אֲהֵבַתְהוּ 1S 18:28
2. m.	קְטַלְתַּנִי	—		קְטַלְתָּהוּ קְטַלְתּוֹ
2. f.	[c]קְטַלְתִּינִי	—		קְטַלְתִּיהוּ
1. c.	—	קְטַלְתִּיךָ	קְטַלְתִּיךְ	קְטַלְתִּיהוּ קְטַלְתִּיו
plur. 3. c.	קְטָלוּנִי	קְטָלוּךָ אֲהֵבוּךָ	קְטָלוּךְ	קְטָלוּהוּ
2. m	[f]קְטַלְתּוּנִי			קְטַלְתּוּהוּ
1. c.	—	קְטַלְנוּךָ	קְטַלְנוּךְ	קְטַלְנוּהוּ
Inf. Ḳal	[g]קָטְלִי [h]קָטְלֵנִי	[i]קָטְלְךָ קָטָלְךָ קְצָרְךָ [j] Lv 23:22	קָטְלֵךְ	קָטְלוֹ קָטְלֵהוּ עֲשֹׂהוּ Ex 18:18
Imp. Ḳal (from Imperfect in a)	[m]קָטְלֵנִי שְׁמָעֵנִי שְׁמָעוּנִי			[n]קָטְלֵהוּ מְשָׁחֵהוּ
Imperfect Ḳal 3. m.	יִקְטְלֵנִי יִלְבָּשֵׁנִי [q]	יִקְטָלְךָ יִקְטָלֶךָּ יִקְטָלְךָ יִלְבָּשְׁךָ	יִקְטְלֵךְ יִלְבָּשֵׁךְ	[p]יִקְטְלֵהוּ יִלְבָּשֵׁהוּ
With Dagesh or Nun suffix 3 m. [*Nun Energicum*]	[r]יִקְטְלֶנִּי	יִקְטְלֶךָּ		[t]יִקְטְלֶנּוּ
Plur. 3. m.	יִקְטְלוּנִי	[w]יִקְטְלוּךָ	יִקְטְלוּךְ	[w]יִקְטְלוּהוּ יִגְאָלוּהוּ
Participles m. sing. [y]	קֹטְלִי קֹטְלֵנִי	קֹטֶלְךָ	קֹטְלֵךְ	קֹטְלוֹ קֹטְלֵהוּ
Perfect Pi'el 3. m.	[z]קִטְּלַנִי	קִטֶּלְךָ	קִטְּלֵךְ	קִטְּלוֹ

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

WITH SUFFIXES

3 sing. f.	1 plur.	2 plur. m.	2 plur. f.	3 plur. m.	3f. plur.
קְטָלָהּ שְׂנֵאָהּ	קְטָלֶנוּ	קְטַלְכֶם	קְטַלְכֶן	קְטָלָם (לְבֵשָׁם)	קְטָלָן
[b] קְטָלַתָּה	קְטָלַתְנוּ	קְטָלַתְכֶם (קְטַלְתְּכֶם) [a]	קְטָלַתְכֶן (קְטַלְתְּכֶן) [a]	[b] קְטָלָתַם	קְטָלָתַן
קְטַלְתָּהּ	קְטַלְתָּנוּ	=	=	קְטַלְתָּם	קְטַלְתָּן
קְטַלְתִּיהָ	[d] קְטַלְתִּינוּ			[e] קְטַלְתִּים	קְטַלְתִּין
קְטַלְתִּיהָ		קְטַלְתִּיכֶם	קְטַלְתִּיכֶן	קְטַלְתִּים	קְטַלְתִּין
קְטָלוּהָ יְרִשׁוּהָ	קְטָלוּנוּ שְׁאֵלוּנוּ	קְטָלוּכֶם (קְטַלְוּכֶם) [a]	קְטָלוּכֶן (קְטַלְוּכֶן) [a]	קְטָלוּם	קְטָלוּן
קְטַלְתּוּהָ	קְטַלְתּוּנוּ	—	—	קְטַלְתּוּם	קְטַלְתּוּן
קְטַלְנוּהָ	—	קְטַלְנוּכֶם	קְטַלְנוּכֶן	קְטַלְנוּם	קְטַלְנוּן
קְטָלָהּ קְטָלֶהָ [j]	קְטָלֵנוּ	קְטָלְכֶם (קְטָלְכֶם) [k]	קְטָלְכֶן (קְטָלְכֶן)	קְטָלָם	[i] קְטָלָן
קְטָלָהּ קְטָלֶהָ '	קְטָלֵנוּ	—	—	[l] קְטָלֵם	קְטָלֵן
יִקְטְלֶהָ יִלְבְּשֶׁהָ יִקְטְלָהּ	יִקְטְלֵנוּ יִלְבְּשֵׁנוּ	יִקְטְלְכֶם	יִקְטְלְכֶן	[n] יִקְטְלֵם יִלְבְּשֵׁם	[m] יִקְטְלֵן
יִקְטְלֶנָּה	יִקְטְלֶנּוּ	—	—		
יִקְטְלוּהָ	יִקְטְלוּנוּ	יִקְטְלוּכֶם	יִקְטְלוּכֶן	יִקְטְלוּם	[x] יִקְטְלוּן
קַטְּלָהּ	קַטְּלֵנוּ	קַטְּלְכֶם	קַטְּלְכֶן	קַטְּלָם but רוֹדֵם Ps 68:28	קַטְּלָן
קַטְּלָהּ	קַטְּלֶנוּ	סַטְּלְכֶם	סַטְּלְכֶן	קַטְּלָם	קַטְּלָן

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

§ 30. The Perfect with Pronominal Suffixes

a. a].* The Dagesh in the Nun of יִסְּרַנִּי Ps 118:19 and דָּנַנִּי Gn 30:6 is regarded by some grammarians as due to the assimilation of the pleonastic Nun [cf. Ḥayyuj, Kokowzoff's *Noviye Materiali*, Russian text, 37f. and Ibn Janaḥ, *Opusc.* 214f.]. This Nun manifests itself in the case of אֶתְּקֶנְךָּ Jr 22:24 (for אֶנְתְּקֶנְךָּ), יְכַבְּדָנְנִי Ps 50:23, יְסֹבְבֶנְהוּ ... יִצְּרֶנְהוּ Dt 32:10, יַעַבְרֻנְהוּ Jr 5:22 and is assimilated in אַרְאֶךָּ Gn 12:1, וִיחֻנֶּךָּ Nu 6:25.[171] More probably, however, this Dagesh is euphonic [cf. above, note 84].

b. b]. The feminine ending ־ָה is replaced by ־ַת, ־ָת [or ת], as is the case also in nouns [but see above, note 105]. In פְּקָדַתּוּ this feminine afformative is absorbed and compensated by Dagesh in the pronominal suffix תּוּ.[172]

c. *Rem.* 1. The feminine afformative (ת) in קְטָלַתְהֶם is vocalized with Pathaḥ on account of its being toneless.

d. c]. In יְלִדְתָּנִי Jr 2:27 the Ḳameṣ under the ת is in place of Ḥireḳ, the reference being to אֶבֶן which is feminine. The Ḥireḳ under the second radical is in place of Pathaḥ, and the word should be vocalized יְלַדְתִּנִי. Similarly הִשְׁבַּעְתָּנִי Jos 2:17.20 is for הִשְׁבַּעְתִּנִי.

e. d]. A Ṣere instead of Ḥireḳ under the afformative occurs in הוֹרַדְתֵּנוּ Jos 2:18. The interchange of Ḥireḳ and Ṣere is not unusual in Hebrew, cf. the case of the participial forms פֹּעֵל and פֹּעִיל (תּוֹמִיךְ Ps 16:5 and יוֹסִיף Is 29:14)[173] and the Imperfect forms of the Hif'il יַפְעֵל and יַפְעִיל.

f. e]. The Ḥireḳ under the ת replaces the Shewa for euphonic reasons, in order to avoid the concurrence of three Shewas (פְּקַדְתִּם).[174]

* [On the meaning of these designations see above, p. 47, footnote].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

g. f]. The Mem denoting the plural is here replaced by Waw, the latter also having plural characteristics.[175]

§ 31. The Infinitive with Pronominal Suffixes

a. The Infinitive with pronominal suffixes is to be distinguished from the noun of the same formation and stem by the Ḳameṣ ḥatuf in the second radical, e. g. לְשָׁמְרְךָ Ex 23:20, אֲכָלְךָ Gn 2:17. In the noun the Ḥolem is retained, e. g. בְּכוֹרְךָ, שְׁלוֹמְךָ. Hence הֲמָנְכֶם Ez 5:7 is an Infinitive and not a noun.[176]

b. When the second radical is a laryngeal it takes Ḥatef Ḳameṣ, while the first radical takes a long Ḳameṣ [see above, note 22], e. g. מָאָסְכֶם Is 30:12, בָּחֳרִי Ez 20:5, etc. Sometimes we find a long Ḳameṣ under the first radical, even when not followed by a laryngeal, as in בְּקָרְבְכֶם Dt 20:3.

c. In the Infinitive Pi'el the Ṣere under the second radical becomes Segol or Ḥireḳ before the suffixes ךָ–,[a] כֶם–, e. g. דַבֶּרְךָ Ex 4:10, דַבֶּרְכֶם Ez 13:8 and וּבְפָרִשְׂכֶם Is 1:15.

d. The פֹּעֶל formations occur sometimes with Ḥireḳ,[177] or Segol, or Pathaḥ (when the second radical is a laryngeal) under the first radical, e. g. בְּשִׁבְרִי Lv 26:26, בְּפִתְחִי Ez 37:13, בְּחֶטְאָה Nu 15:28, לְפַעֲמוֹ Ju 13:25, מַחְאֲךָ Ez 25:6 (the Pathaḥ under the ר in וְרַקְעֲךָ in the same sentence is probably due to the preceding מַחְאֲךָ, on the principle of assonance [see below § 36m.]; also with composite Shewa under the first radical, e. g. לַחֲנַנְכֶם Is 30:18.

a. In pause ךְ– or ךָּ– [with compensatory Dagesh for the *Nun Energicum*, cf. above, note 171], *e. g.* כַּבְּדֶךָ Nu 22:37, לְקַלְלֶךָּ Dt 23:5.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

e. g]. This Ḳameṣ takes the tone in מִיָּורְדִי Ps 30:4 and רָדופִי Ps. 38:21 [in our text מִיָּורְדִ֑י and רָֽדוּפִי־].

f. h]. This form is mostly used when the person referred to by the pronominal suffix is in the accusative, but there are exceptions, e. g. בְּשׁוּבֵנִי Ez 47:7, יַבְּמִי Dt 25:7, לְתִתִּי Nu 22:13, עָצְבִּי 1Chr 4:10.[179]

g. i] Also קְטַלְנָה, e. g. לְיַחְמֶנָּה Gn 30:41 [see below, Note 232].

h. j] עָמָדְךָ Ob 11 occurs with Ga'ya in some correct Mss. In לְהָרָגְךָ 1S 24:11 Ben Asher reads Ḥatef Pathaḥ under the ג and, therefore, long Ḳameṣ under the ר [in our text לְהָרָגְךָ]. Cf. also לְמָשָׁחֲךָ 1S 15:1 [Baer reads לִמְשָׁחֲךָ].

i. k]. Also וּבְקֻצְרְכֶם Lv 19:9 and בְּמֹצַאֲכֶם Gn 32:20.[180] In the case of the first radical being a laryngeal: אֲכָלְכֶם Gn 3:5, בַּאֲכָלְכֶם Nu 15:19, also בֶּאֱמָרְכֶם Mal 1:7.

j. l]. It occurs also with suffixed ־ָה, e. g. בֹּאָנָה Jr 8:7.

§ 32. The Imperative with Pronominal Suffixes

a. The first radical takes Ḳameṣ ḥatuf or Ḥireḳ. When, however, the Imperative is of the פְּעַל formation, which includes also verbs with middle and third laryngeals, the Shewa is retained and the Pathaḥ is lengthened to Ḳameṣ, e. g. רְפָאֵנִי Jr 17:14, סְעָדֵנִי Ps 119:117, גְּאָלָהּ ibid. 69:19 [cf. below § 33a].

b. The forms קִטְלִי, קִטְלוּ combine with the pronominal suffixes without undergoing any change, while קְטֹלְנָה is modified to קִטְלוּ under the influence of this combination.

c. m]. It occurs as long Ḳameṣ with Metheg in שָׁמְרֵנִי

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ps 16:1. [On the pronunciation of this Ḳameṣ see above, note 22].

d. n]. Also קָטְלוֹ according to Ḥayyuj [N. 115], who adduces the case of וְקָבְנוֹ Nu 23:13, maintaining its stem to be קָבַן. This opinion is rejected by Moshe ha-Kohen [in adnot. to Ḥayyuj, ibid. 116], who argues that the form קָטְלוֹ never occurs in the Imperative. The form וְקָבְנוֹ, however, may be explained on the analogy of יִלְכְּדֻנוֹ, Pr 5:22 [see below, note 185] and יֶשְׁנוֹ Es 3:8, where the suffix נוֹ represents the third person pronoun, the correct form being קָבֵנּוּ.[181]

e. o]. Also with Ḥireḳ under the first radical, e. g. נִצְּרֶהָ Pr 4:13 and with suffixed נָּה: קְרָאֶנָּה Jr 36:15 and שְׁמָעֶנָּה Jb 5:27.

f. p]. Also with the ending מוֹ, e. g. שִׁיתֵמוֹ Ps 83:12 הֲנִיעֵמוֹ and הוֹרִידֵמוֹ ibid 59:12.

§ 33. The Imperfect with Pronominal Suffixes

a. In the Imperfect the Ḥolem in the second syllable of the יִקְטֹל formation changes to Ḳameṣ ḥatuf [in a closed syllable], or to Shewa [in an open syllable];[a] whilst the Pathaḥ in the יִפְעַל formations, including verbs with middle or third laryngeals, is retained but is lengthened to Ḳameṣ on account of its being in an open pretonic syllable[b] [this was already observed by Ibn Janaḥ, *Riḳ*. 84 and 98], e. g. יִקְטְלֵךְ, יִקְטְלְכֶם, יִפְגָּשְׁךָ Gn 32:18 (with

a. Sometimes also to Ḥatef Ḳameṣ, as in יִקֳּבֶנּוּ Is 62:2, וְאֶסֳּרֵם Hos 10:10, and יִרְדֳּפֶךָ Ez 35:6 (according to Ben Asher, but יִרְדְּפֶךָ according to Ben Naftali).

b. But also וָאֶעְנְלֵךְ Ez 16:10 and יֶאֱחֲזוּךְ Jr 13:21.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Metheg),[a] but יְקָבֵהוּ, יְקַטְלְךָ, יְקַטְלֵנִי Jb 3:8 (from נקב, cf. אֶקֹּב Nu 23:8 [but see below § 38d and note 273]), תְּנֵהוּ Ne 1:11 (יִתֵּן also following the analogy of יִפְעַל); and, of the יִפְעַל formations, יִירָשְׁךָ Gn 15:4, תִּדְבָּקַנִי ibid 19:19, וַיִּקָּחֻהוּ ibid 37:24, שָׂאֵהוּ Nu 11:12, קָחֶנּוּ 1S 20:21, יִסְחָבוּם Jr 49:20, אֶלְבָּשֶׁנָּה Cn 5:3, etc.

b. In the Pi'el and Po'el the Ṣere under the second radical changes, like the Ḥolem in the Ḳal, to Shewa, but before the suffixes ־ְךָ and ־ְכֶם it becomes Segol, e. g. אֲמַגֶּנְךָ Hos 11:8, אֲבָרֶכְךָ Gn 22:17, etc. In תְּכַבֵּדְךָ Pr 4:8 and וְיַגֵּדְךָ Dt 32:7 the tone-bearing Ṣere is retained. In אֲאַמִּצְכֶם Jb 16:5 the Ṣere is changed to Ḥireḳ.

c. q]. The Ṣere under the third radical is sometimes changed to Pathaḥ, e. g. יֶאֱהָבַנִי Gn 29:32, תִּדְבָּקַנִי Gn 19:19, יַבְדִּילַנִי Is 56:3, יַשְׂבִּיעַנִי Jb 9:18, יִרְאַנִי Ex 33:20 and, with Dagesh in the suffix ־נִּי, תְּבַעֲתַנִּי Jb 7:14, יוֹעִידֶנִּי Jr 49:19.

d. r]. The Segol under the third radical is due to the Dagesh following it.

e. s]. Also יִקְטְלוֹ e. g. יִרְדְּפוֹ Hos 8:3, יִתְקְפוֹ Ec 4:12, יִקְרְאוֹ Jr 23:6, תִּתְּנוֹ Ex 22:29 and תִּלְכְּדוֹ Ps 35:8.

f. t]. This form as well as the following, יִקְטְלֶנָּה, is euphonic for יִקְטְלֶנְהוּ and יִקְטְלֶנְהָ, examples of which are יִצְּרֶנְהוּ, יְסֹבְבֶנְהוּ Dt 32:10, יְבָרֲכֶנְהוּ Ps 72:15, יִמְצָאֻנְהָ Jr 2:24.[182]

g. u]. (a) Also אַפְאֵיהֶם Dt 32:26 [cf. on this form below § 41d and note 342]. (b) The Pathaḥ under the

a. This form may, however, be referred to a יִפְעַל formation, although we find also וַתִּפְגֹּשׁ 1S 25:20 and אֶפְגְּשֵׁם Hos 13:8. Some verbs occur in both formations, e. g. יִזְעָמוּהוּ Pr 24:24 and אֶזְעֹם Nu 23:8, יִקְרָאֻהוּ Ps 145:18 and יִקְרְאוֹ Jr 23:6 [cf. above § 19a].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

third radical in אֲמִילַם Ps 118:10 is in place of Ṣere on account of the pause [cf. above § 16b]. (c) Instances with Ḳameṣ under the third radical, after the example of the Perfect, instead of Ṣere, are יִלְבָּשָׁם Ex 29:30 and יְשִׂימָם Dt 7:15. (d) וַיְחָלְקֵם 1 Chr 24:3 [in our text וַיֶּחָלְקֵם] is for וַיַּחַלְקֵם, the Ḳameṣ under the ח having arisen as a result of the change of the Pathaḥ under the preceding Yod to Segol.[183] Similarly וְאֵסָעֲרֵם Zc 7:14 is regarded by some as a composite form of Ḳal and Pi'el. The correct opinion, however, is that expressed by my father, in Ziḳ., viz. that the form is Ḳal in the intransitive sense, for וְאֶסְעֲרֵם,[184] with the pronominal suffix ־ָם in the meaning of עִמָּם "with them," as in יְשֻׂשׂוּם Is 35:1, the sense being, in the vein of בְּכָל צָרָתָם לוֹ צָר ibid 63:9, "I shall be tossed about with them in the exile." The lengthening of the Segol under the א to Ṣere and of the Shewa under the ס to Ḳameṣ is caused by the laryngeal middle radical ע.

h. v]. It occurs with Pathaḥ instead of Ṣere in יְחִיתַן Hab 2:17 [cf. below § 38q and note 288].

i. w]. Also יִלְכְּדֻנוֹ Pr 5:22,[185] יַעַבְרֻנְהוּ Jr 5:22 and יְשָׁרְתוּנֶךָ Is 60:10. [On the *Nun Energicum* in these forms see above, note 171].

j. x]. As to וַיְגָרְשׁוּם Ex 2:17, Moshe ha-Kohen, quoted by Ibn Ezra, maintains that the pronominal Nun is changed to Mem in order to avoid confusing it with the *Nun Paragogicum* [as in תִשְׁמְעוּן Dt 8:20].[186] Cf., however, יַהַרְגוּן Zc 11:5.

k. y]. On the other forms of the participle active and passive, see below §§ 49 and 53.

l. z]. On וְיִסְּרֵנִי Is 8:11 cf. above § 29c.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOTES: CHAPTER THREE C

[168] So Saadia, but cf. Dunash's criticism (*Tesh. ag. Saadia* 27f.) and below, note 658.

[169] This is the opinion of Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 72). According to M. L. Margolis (*AJSL*, XIX, 45ff.), however, this is derived from an original form וּבְצַעְמוֹ, on the analogy of וַהֲרָגָתַם Am 9:4 from הֲרָגָתְמוֹ. Cf. also Pinsker, *Lik.*, Addenda 142.

[170] The pronominal suffixes כֶם־ן in combination with these forms are not extant in the Bible and are rather to be avoided, according to Ibn Ezra (*Ṣ.* 45ab and 46ab). In any event, the antepretonic Ḳameṣ in these forms would be reduced to Shewa.

[171] The term employed by the mediaeval grammarians is "added" or expletive Nun (*Al-Nun al-Zā'idah*, Hebrew: נו״ן נוספת). Various explanations of the origin of this Nun are offered by the modern grammarians (see Koenig I, 225–227 and Ges.-K. § 58i, notes 2 and 3). According to some it goes back to an original syllable *an* or *in*, traces of which may also be found in the Hebrew cohortative (cf. above, note 97) and serves as a connecting element inserted between the suffix and the verbal form in order to give this form greater emphasis. They call this Nun, after Koenig (op. cit.), *Nun Energicum*. Others connect the forms with this Nun with the Arabic "energetic" mood (*yaḳtulan* and *yaḳtulanna*), cf. Bauer-Leander 338.

[172] Thus also the ה of the pronominal suffix is accordingly changed to תּ–, in order to admit of Dagesh to compensate for the lost feminine characteristic תְ–. This is the opinion resorted to by Joseph Ḳimḥi, since the Dagesh never compensates, according to him, for the loss of the letter which follows it (*Zik.* 9 and 32). Cf. also below, note 182, with reference to יִקְטְלֶנּוּ. In both these cases, however, the sharpening of the תּ and the נּ is due to the loss of the ה (see Ges.-K. § 58i and § 59g.).

[173] So Ḥayyuj (N. 27), Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 87) and Ibn Ezra (*Sefath Yether* 38), over against Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Saadia* 51), who reads here אוֹסִיףְ. Modern grammarians are, likewise, at variance, the majority favoring Ḳimḥi's opinion (cf. Koenig I, 403f. and Ges.-K. § 50e).

[174] It is, however, more plausible to explain it that, for euphonic

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

reasons, the original form of the second person fem. suffix (תִּי = אַתִּי, see above, note 69) is here preserved, as also in the 2nd per. fem. sing. קְטַלְתִּינִי. On this original form of the 2nd sing. fem. see an elaborate discussion by Pinsker, *Mabo* 90ff.

[175] In point of fact, the ם of the 2. m. pl. ending—*tumu* (<תֶּם) is dropped in this instance by haplology, on account of the following homo-organic consonant נ, thereby effecting the lengthening of—*tŭ* to—*tū*, thus:—*tŭmŭ*+*ni*>—*tŭ*(*m*)*ŭni* >—*tūni*; cf. English "idolatry" <idololatria (LL).

[176] Ḳimḥi accepts here Ibn Janaḥ's opinion (*Shor*. 121) in referring this form to the stem המן. This seems more plausible than to derive it with the modern grammarians (Koenig II, 128 and Olsh. § 215d) from the noun המון.

[177] There are also a few examples of the פְּעֹל formation that fall in this category, e. g. בִּבְגְדוֹ Ex 21:8, מִכְרָם Am 2:6 (but מָכְרָהּ Ex 21:8), נִפְלוֹ 2S 1:10 (but נָפְלוֹ 1S 29:3), לְשִׂטְנוֹ Zc 3:1, etc. Barth ("Das *i*-Imperfect im Nordsemitischen," *ZDMG*, 1889, 177ff.) refers all the forms with Ḥireḳ in the initial radical to original *i*-Imperfects (יִקְטֹל). According to Pinsker (*Mabo* 154), however, the Ḥirek in all these forms is in place of Ḳibbuṣ, on the analogy of קְצִרְךָ Lv 23:22 (see above, notes 16 and 93).

[178] בְּשׁוּבֵנִי is regarded by some of the moderns as a scribal error, caused by וַיְשִׁבֵנִי in verse 6, while in יְבָמִי the Yod is regarded by Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 27) as pleonastic, like that in תֹּפְשִׂי . . . שֹׁכְנִי Jr 49:16; since, in his opinion, only the suffix ־ֵנִי is possible when the person referred to is in the accusative. This seems to be the view held also by Ibn Chiquitilla (cf. Ibn Ezra to Nu 22:13), but is rejected by Ibn Ezra (ibid.).

[179] Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 203) makes this distinction between קָטְלְךָ and קְטָלְךָ: In the former the suffix refers to the second person as the agent, e. g. וּבְשָׁכְבְּךָ Dt 6:7, in the latter the second person referred to is the recipient of the action, e. g. לִשְׁמָרְךָ Ex 23:20. But cf. אֲכָלְךָ Gn 2:17.

[180] According to Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 199) the form בְּמָצְאֲכֶם (or rather בְּמָצְאֲכֶם) was originally intended, for euphonic reasons, in place of בְּמָצְאֲכֶם. This resulted by the laws of phonetic changes in בְּמֹצַאֲכֶם on the analogy of תְּאָרְכֶם,* תָּאֳרוֹ (see below § 47c¹). So also the modern grammarians (cf. Ges.-K. § 93q).

[181] This is the opinion of Ibn Janaḥ (Opusc. 213–217) and also of the modern grammarians (cf. Ges.-K. §67o and note). In an elaborate discussion Ibn Janah explains the Nun either as an expletive, as in the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

case of forms like תָּמְנוּ La 3:22 (for תַּמּוּ), יְקוּמוּן, יְכַבְּדָנְנִי Ps 50:23, אֵבְדַן Es 8:6, לְחַתַּן 1K 4:19, etc.; or as a pronominal, as in יְסָבֻנּוּ Jr, 52:21, יְדֻשֶׁנּוּ Is 28:28, etc. The Nun is intended, according to the first explanation, to compensate, as it were, for the missing Dagesh of the ב (=קַבּוֹ or קָבוֹ). Cf. below §38a and note 270. According to the second etymology, the omission of the Dagesh in the Nun of וְקָבְנוֹ is due to the 'lightening" (dropping of the vowel and the Dagesh) of the ב, since this Dagesh never follows a vowelless consonant. The latter view is held also by Ibn Chiquitilla (Adnot to Hayyuj, N. 116). Cf. also below, note 566.

[182] According to Joseph Ḳimḥi the Nun in יְקַטְּלֶנָּה and יְקַטְּלֶנּוּ replaces the ה as pronominal suffix in order to allow of Dagesh to compensate for the "pleonastic" Nun (*Nun Energicum*, see above, notes 171 and 172).

[183] According to Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 201) this is for וַיְחַלְּקֵם, the Segol (Pathaḥ ḳaṭan) and the Pathaḥ being interchangeable (cf. above § 3a). Ḳimḥi's explanation of the Ḳameṣ under the ח is probably based on the fact that a laryngeal with Ḳameṣ ordinarily follows a Segol which replaces a Pathaḥ (cf. above § 9h). The moderns read here וַיְחַלְּקֵם (cf. Ges.-K. § 63n and Bauer-Leander 352).

[184] Ḳimḥi confuses here inadvertently Ibn Janaḥ's opinion with that of his father. In *Ziḳ*. p. 40 Joseph Ḳimḥi distinctly construes this form as a composite of Ḳal and Pi'el; while the opinion accepted by David Ḳimḥi, which is here attributed to his father, is found in *Riḳ*. p. 201. Some of the moderns take it as an Aramaism for וָאֲסָעֲרֵם (cf. Bauer-Leander 357). More probably, however, the Ṣere is in place of Ḥatef Segol before Ḳameṣ, cf. אֱזָרֶה Lv 26:33, Ez 5:12 and 12:14. The preference for the series Segol-Ḳameṣ, or Hatef-Segol-Ḳameṣ, is not an uncommon phenomenon in Hebrew, cf. above § 9h, etc.; see also below, notes 306 and 436. This form may thus have developed in the following manner: וָאֲסָעֲרֵם > וְאֶסְעָרֵם > וְאֶסָעֲרֵם > וְאֵסָעֲרֵם, cf. לֵאמֹר (for לֶאֱמֹר, see below, note 623). The latter evolved into וָאֵסָעֲרֵם by a process of distention, probably in order to restore artificially the quiescent radical; cf. below, note 205.

[185] Ḳimḥi reads this word with Dagesh forte in the Nun, since he regards the ending נּוּ as the pronominal suffix of the third person (see above § 32d) and the second Nun as an expletive (*Nun Energicum*, see above, note 171). Ibn Janaḥ, however, reads apparently, with our text, יְלַכְּדֶנוּ, without Dagesh in the Nun, regarding the Nun as an expletive and not as a pronominal suffix (see *Riḳ*. 116).

[186] In his commentary ad l., also in *Ṣ*. 45b and *Yesod* 9, Ibn Ezra advances this explanation without attributing it to Ibn Chiquitilla.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

D. WEAK VERBS[187]

§ 34. Verbs Primae Radicalis Nun (פ״ן). נָגַשׁ

VERBS פ״ן

	Kal		Nif'al	Hif'il	Hof'al
Perf. Sing. 3m.	נָפַל	נָגַשׁ	נִגַּשׁ	הִגִּישׁ	הֻגַּשׁ
3f.			נִגְּשָׁה	הִגִּישָׁה	הֻגְּשָׁה
2m.			נִגַּשְׁתָּ	הִגַּשְׁתָּ	הֻגַּשְׁתָּ
2f.			נִגַּשְׁתְּ	הִגַּשְׁתְּ	הֻגַּשְׁתְּ
1c.	reg.		נִגַּשְׁתִּי	הִגַּשְׁתִּי	הֻגַּשְׁתִּי
Pl. 3c.			נִגְּשׁוּ	הִגִּישׁוּ	הֻגְּשׁוּ
2m.			נִגַּשְׁתֶּם	הִגַּשְׁתֶּם	הֻגַּשְׁתֶּם
2f.			נִגַּשְׁתֶּן	הִגַּשְׁתֶּן	הֻגַּשְׁתֶּן
1c.			נִגַּשְׁנוּ	הִגַּשְׁנוּ	הֻגַּשְׁנוּ
Inf.	[b]נְפֹל etc.	[a]גֶּשֶׁת	הִנָּגֵשׁ	[d]הַגִּישׁ	הֻגַּשׁ
Inf. Absol.		נָגוֹשׁ	[e]נִגּוֹף הִנָּגֵשׁ	הַגֵּשׁ	הֻגֵּשׁ
Imp. Sing. m.	[c]נְפֹל	[e]גַּשׁ	הִנָּגֵשׁ	הַגֵּשׁ	
f.	נִפְלִי	[f]גְּשִׁי	הִנָּגְשִׁי	הַגִּישִׁי	
Pl. m.	נִפְלוּ	גְּשׁוּ	הִנָּגְשׁוּ	הַגִּישׁוּ	
f.	נְפֹלְנָה	גַּשְׁנָה	הִנָּגַשְׁנָה	הַגֵּשְׁנָה	
Impf. Sing. 3m.	[g]יִפֹּל	יִגַּשׁ	יִנָּגֵשׁ	[g]יַגִּישׁ	יֻגַּשׁ
3f.	תִּפֹּל	תִּגַּשׁ		תַּגִּישׁ	תֻּגַּשׁ
2m.	תִּפֹּל	תִּגַּשׁ		תַּגִּישׁ	תֻּגַּשׁ
2f.	תִּפְּלִי	תִּגְּשִׁי		תַּגִּישִׁי	תֻּגְּשִׁי
1c.	אֶפֹּל	אֶגַּשׁ	regular	אַגִּישׁ	אֻגַּשׁ
Pl. 3m.	יִפְּלוּ	[h]יִגְּשׁוּ		יַגִּישׁוּ	יֻגְּשׁוּ
3f.	תִּפֹּלְנָה	תִּגַּשְׁנָה		תַּגֵּשְׁנָה	תֻּגַּשְׁנָה
2m.	תִּפְּלוּ	תִּגְּשׁוּ		תַּגִּישׁוּ	תֻּגְּשׁוּ
2f.	תִּפֹּלְנָה	תִּגַּשְׁנָה		תַּגֵּשְׁנָה	תֻּגַּשְׁנָה
1c.	נִפֹּל	נִגַּשׁ		נַגִּישׁ	נֻגַּשׁ
Shortened Impf.	(jussive)			יַגֵּשׁ	
act.		נֹגֵשׁ	נִגָּשׁ	מַגִּישׁ	הֻגָּשׁ
pass.		נָגוּשׁ		מֻגָּשׁ	

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

a. a].* The לְ prefixed to this form becomes לָ, except in the construct state, e. g. לְשֶׁבֶת אַבְרָם Gn 16:3, לְשֶׁבֶת עָר Nu 21:15. With suffixes: גִּשְׁתִּי, etc. [On the suffixed ־ָת see below § 36b and note 207].

b. b]. With prefixed ל: לִנְפֹּל. In talmudic Hebrew, however, we find לִפֹּל, לִטֹּל, לִמֹּל.[187a]

c. c]. Also הִנָּתוֹן Jr 32:4, 38:2.

d. d]. We also find לַנְפֹּל Nu 5:22 for לְהַנְפִּיל,[187b] לְהַנְתִּיךְ Ez 22:20. To this category may also belong the form כְּהִנְדֹּף Ps 68:3. [See also above § 25j and note 158].

e. e]. Also גַּשׁ, which changes to גֶּשׁ when connected by Maḳḳef to the following word, e. g. גֶּשׁ־הָלְאָה Gn 19:9.[187c] But the Segol may also be in place of Pathaḥ [the Segol being regarded by the medieval grammarians as Pathaḥ ḳaṭan, cf. above §3a]. With paragogic ־ָה: גְּשָׁה Gn 27:21.

f. f]. It occurs with Ḥolem in גֹּשִׁי Ru 2:14, גֹּשׁוּ Jos 3:9 [cf. below §36k and note 217].

g. g]. In mishnic Hebrew we find פּוֹל Tosef. Dem. VI, 4 and דּוֹר Snh. III, 2, from נָפַל and נָדַר respectively. Such forms in the Imperative are suggested by the Imperfect and are legitimate.

h. h]. Also יִצַּתּוּ Is 33:12 and יֵחַתּוּ Jb 21:13 (cf. וְנִצְּתָה 2 K 22:17 and הִצִּיתוּ 2 S 14:31 [but see below § 36 l], and וַתִּנְחַת Ps 38:3), with pausal Dagesh [cf. above § 16b and note 84].

i. i]. The following also occur: הֲיִנְטוֹר Jr 3:5, תִּנְצְרֵנִי Ps 140:2.5, תִּנְצְרֶכָּה Pr 2:11 [on the Dagesh in the כ see above, note 171].

* On the meaning of these designations see above, p. 47, footnote.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

j. j]. Also יִגַּשׁ [Jb 40:19], etc.; in pause, or before a laryngeal third radical, with Pathaḥ, in the second syllable, e. g. וַיִּגַּשׁ Ju 6:19, וַיַּסַּע Ps 78:52, תַּבַּעְנָה ibid 119:171.

k. *Rem*. 1. וַנָּבֶל Is 64:5 is in place of וַנִּנָּבֶל in which case the first radical dropped out, leaving its vowel to the preformative Nun. Others regard it as being in place of וַנֵּבֶל, the lengthened vowel under the Nun compensating for the Dagesh in the second radical.[188] Similarly, וַיָּזֶד Gn 25:29 in place of וַיִּזֶד, from נָזַד, and וַיָּשַׂר 1 Chr 20:3 [וַיָּשַׂר in our text] from נָסַר = נָשַׂר.[189]

l. *Rem*. 2. The verb נתן is unique in that both Nuns, at the beginning and at the end, are subject to assimilation, e. g. (Perfect) נָתַתָּ also תַּתָּה 2 S 22:41; (Imperfect) יִתֵּן, once: נִתַּן לָךְ Ju 16:5; (Inf. Construct) תֵּת, תִּתִּי, (on the analogy of גֶּשֶׁת), with prefixed ל, לָתֵת, also לִתְתָּן 1 K 6:19;[190] (Imperative) תֵּן. Before a Maḳḳef connecting with a tone-syllable the Ṣere changes to Segol, e. g. וַתִּתֶּן־לָנוּ Nu 16:4, תִּתֶּן־לוֹ Dt 15:14, לָתֶת־לְךָ Gn 15:7, תֶּן־לִי ibid 14:21.[a]

m. *Rem*. 3. The Verb לקח is treated as a Primae Radicalis Nun.[191] Thus, Imperfect Ḳal יִקַּח,[b] Infinitive Construct קַחַת (once קְחַת 2 K 12:9), Imperative קַח, also

a. In but two instances the Segol occurs even before a tone-less syllable, e. g. תֶּן־לָהֶם Ps 28:4, וְתֶן־עָלֶיהָ Nu 17:11. Otherwise תֵּן לָהֶם Hos 9:14.[190a]

b. The Dagesh is omitted for euphonic reasons on account of frequent usage, in ק with shewa, e. g. וְיִקְחוּ Ex 25:2, וְאֶקְחָה Gn 8:5, etc. Similarly the Dagesh is omitted in the ס in the case of the verb נסע, e. g. וַיִּסְעוּ, מַסְעֵי, מַסְעֵיהֶם [According to Rittenberg, Adnot. to *Mikhlol* 198b, the omission of the Dagesh in these instances, thus rendering the Shewa silent, is intended to prevent the slurring over of the following laryngeals].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

לְקַח Ex 29:1, etc. In pause קָח 1S 21:10, קְחוּ Gn 43:13. An anomalous apheresis of the ל occurs in the perfect קָח Ez 17:5 and קָחָם Hos 11:3. The latter may, however, be an Infinitive with pronominal suffix in place of לְלָקְחָם in which case the Ḳameṣ of the omitted radical is taken over by the ק.[192] In the Nif'al the ל is retained, e. g. נִלְקַח Ez 33:6, נִלְקְחָה 1S 4:17.

n. *Rem.* 4. The form נִתְּעוּ Jb 4:10 is also regarded by Ḥayyuj as apheretic for נִלְתְּעוּ, the stem being לתע (cf. מַלְתְּעוֹת Ps 58:7). Some grammarians, however, take it as Nif'al from תעה, the Dagesh in the ת being euphonic.[193] My brother, Moses construes it as a forma mixta, composed of Nif'al and Hithpa'el from תעה like וְנִכַּפֵּר Dt 21:8 [cf. above § 23 l].

§ 35. Verbs Primae Radicalis א (פ״א), e. g. אכל

a. The א in these verbs frequently coalesces in the Imperfect with the preformatives[a] to form a long vowel, Ḥolem. After the preformative א, the א radical is dropped altogether.

b. The following verbs are regularly subject to this coalescence: אָבַד, אָכַל, אָמַר, אָבָה, אָפָה, אָחַז [but יֶאֱחֹז Ju 16:3 or 1K 6:10 and תֶּאֱחֹז Ec 7:18]. A few other פ״א verbs share with these this peculiarity only occasionally, e. g. אֹהַב Mal 1:2, etc., יֶאֱהַב (also אֵהֲב [for אֹהֵב] Pr 8:17), יֹוסֵף (cf. 2S 6:1, Mi 4:6, Ps 104:29) and יֶאֱסֹף, etc.

a. Also in the perfect Nif'al in these case of וְנֹאחֲזוּ Nu 32:30 (for וְנֶאֶחֲזוּ).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

VERBS פ"א

	Kal	Nif'al	Hif'il	Hof'al
Perf.	אָכַל	נֶאֱכַל	הֶאֱכִיל	הָאֳכַל
Like Verbs Primae Laryngialis		(with quiescence וְנֹאחֲזוּ Nu 32: 30)		
Inf.	אֱכֹל אֲכֹל	הֵאָכֵל	[a] הַאֲכִיל	הָאֳכַל
Inf. Absol.	אָכוֹל	הֵאָכֹל		
Imp. Sing. m.	אֱכֹל	הֵאָכֵל	הַאֲכֵל	
f.	אִכְלִי	etc.	etc.	
Plur. m.	אִכְלוּ (אֱפוּ Ex 16:23)			
f.	אֱכֹלְנָה			
Impf. Sing. 3m.	יֹאכַל [b] יֹאכָל	יֵאָכֵל	[c] יַאֲכִיל	יָאֳכַל
3f.	תֹּאכַל	etc.	etc.	
2m.	תֹּאכַל			
2f.	תֹּאכְלִי			
1c.	אֹכַל			
Plur. 3m.	יֹאכְלוּ			
3f.	תֹּאכַלְנָה			
2m.	תֹּאכְלוּ			
2f.	תֹּאכַלְנָה			
1c.	נֹאכַל			
Impf. w. Waw consec.	וַיֹּאמֶר וַיֹּאכַל			
	אֹכֵל אָכוּל	נֶאֱכָל	מַאֲכִיל מֶאֱכָל	הָאֳכָל

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

c. a]. The form לְהָכִיל Ez 21:33 is regarded by my father as a contraction of לְהַאֲכִיל.[194] Similarly, according to him [*Zik.* 37], וָאַבֶּדְךָ Ez 28:16 is for וָאַאֲבִידְךָ and מַלְּפֵנוּ Jb 35:11, for מַאֲלִיפֵנוּ, the א radical assimilating into the second radical, as in מַכֹּלֶת 1K 5:25 (in place of מַאֲכֹלֶת);[a] while the Shewa under the ל of מַלְּפֵנוּ is, he maintains, instead of Ḥireḳ on the analogy of וַיַּדְרְכוּ Jr 9:2, וַיַּדְבְּקוּ 1S 14:22, וַיַּבְּשֵׁהוּ Na 1:4 (for וַיְיַבְּשֵׁהוּ), and וַיַּכְּתוּם Nu 14:45 (for וַיַּכִּיתוּם from נכת).[b] [195] The last two instances, however; namely, וָאַבֶּדְךָ and מַלְּפֵנוּ, may be construed as Pi'el forms, the first as apheretic of וָאֲאַבֶּדְךָ, like וַאֲאַלֶּפְךָ Jb 33:33, the second — of מְאַלְּפֵנוּ, the preformatives thus taking over the vowel of the elided radical.[c]

d. b]. The Pathaḥ in the second syllable instead of Ḥolem, as indicated by the imperative אֱכֹל and אֱמֹר, is euphonic, purporting to avoid the concurrence of two Ḥolems.[d] [197] In pause this Pathaḥ changes to Ṣere. This is the reason, Ibn Janaḥ maintains, for the pausal Pathaḥ in all cases of וַיֹּאמַר and וַיֹּאכַל, for it is derived from this Ṣere [See above 16b]. Without pause, however, this Ṣere

a. To this category belong, according to Ḥayyuj [N. 19 f.], the forms יַשֹּׁם Jr 19:8, יַשִּׁים ibid 49:20, וַנַּשִּׁים Nu 21:30 (for יַאֲשֹׁם, יַאֲשִׁים, וַנַּאֲשִׁים) [but see below § 38q and note 289], also תִּישַּׁמְנָה Ez 6:6, with א changed to Yod.

b. He bases his contention on the fact that the first radical is never dropped in the Intensive (Pi'el, Pu'al, and Hithpa'el) conjugations.

c. According to Ḥayyuj [N. 14] the reverse is the case, i. e., the א retained is the radical. The preformatives, however, are never dropped;[196] although they may quiesce, as in וָאעַנֶּה 1K 11:39, וָאעְשִׁר Zc 11:5.

d. In הֹרוּ וְהֹגוּ Is 59:3 the Ḥolem is retained on account of the rarity of these verbs in use(but see below § 40g[1]).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

changes to Segol upon the retraction of the tone [e. g. וַיֹּאמֶר].

e. c]. The א [ā] quiesces in a Ḥolem [ō] in Hif'il in אֹבִידָה Jr. 46:8, אוֹכִיל Hos 11:4 [but see below § 50j],[198] אוֹסִיפְךָ 1S 15:6 [in our text אֹסִפְךָ], also probably וָאוֹצְרָה Ne 13:13 [for וָאוֹצִירָה], with Shewa under the צ instead of Ḥireḳ on the analogy of וַיַּדְרְכוּ Jr 9:2. The form וָאוֹצְרָה might also be taken as Ḳal, like וָאוֹמְרָה Ne 5:7, but the context requires a verb in the transitive, the sense being: "I appointed treasurers over the treasuries."[199]

f. *Rem.* 1. The א radical sometimes obscures in Ṣere in the Imperfect instead of Ḥolem,[a] e. g. וָאֵחַר Gn 32:5, אֵהַב Pr 8:17 (but also וַיּוֹחֶר 2S 20:5, unless it is Hif'il, and וָאֹהַב Mal 1:2), תֵּאתֶא Mi 4:8 (also יֶאֱתֶה Jb 37:22 and Pr 1:27).[201] the א, retained orthographically only in the instances quoted, is sometimes entirely dropped, e. g. תֵּשַׁם Gn 47:19 and וַתֵּשַׁם Ez 19:7 (also תֶּאְשַׁם Hos 14:1 and וַיֶּאְשַׁם ibid. 13:1), תֵּחַד Gn 49:6, תֵּזְלִי Jr 2:36, וַיֵּתֵא Dt 33:21 and, in the Hif'il, מֵזִין Pr 17:4.[202]

g. *Rem.* 2. Coalescence or elision of the א occurs also in the Pi'el, e. g. וַתְּזְרֵנִי 2S 23:40, for וַתְּאַזְּרֵנִי Ps 30:12,[203] מַלְּפֵנוּ Jb 35:11, וָאַבֶּדְךָ Ez 28:16 (cf., however, above, c). תְּאָכְלֵהוּ Jb 20:26 is probably a Po'el form for תְּאֹכְלֵהוּ, in which case the Ḥolem changes to Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf as in מְלָשְׁנִי Ps 101:5 (from מְלוֹשֵׁן).[204]

a. Also in Ḳameṣ, e. g. (Hif'il) וַיָּאצֶל Nu 11:25, וַיָּרֶב 1S 15:5, with א missing as in מָסֹרֶת Ez 20:37 and הָסוּרִים Ec 4:14 (for מָאסֹרֶת and הָאֲסוּרִים) [cf. above, note 196]. וַיָּרֶב may, however, be taken as Pi'el for וַיְאָרֵב.[199a] The Pathaḥ in the first syllable of יַהֵל Is 13:20 is in place of Ḳameṣ,[200] in order to dinstinguish it from יָהֵל Jb 31:26, which is of a different stem and meaning.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

h. *Rem.* 3. The form תֵּאֱהָבוּ Pr 1:22 is for תְּאֶהֱבוּ, like יֶאְשְׁמוּ Ps 34:23, with Ṣere under the א, instead of Shewa, in order to prevent the concurrence of the two laryngeal letters. It may also be in place of תֶּאֱהָבוּ, on the analogy of יֶעֶרְבוּ [Hos 9:4], with the Segol of the א lengthened here to Ṣere on account of the following laryngeal with Shewa.[205] Ibn Janaḥ, however, regards it as Pi'el, with Ṣere under the א in place of Pathaḥ [*Opusc.* 15 and 353, also *Shor.* 14].

§ 36. Verbs Primae Radicalis Yod (פ״י), e. g. יָשַׁב

a. In verbs beginning with Yod as a first radical, the Yod undergoes one of the following modifications after preformatives:[206] (a) It is entirely elided orthographically, but remains as latent quiescent after the Ṣere of the preformatives in the Imperfect: אֵשֵׁב (but אֵילְכָה Mi 1:8 [also יֵיקַר Ps 72:14]). (b) It remains orthographically but quiesces in long Ḥireḳ in the Imperfect Ḳal: אִיטַב, or to Ṣere in the Hif'il: אֵיטִיב. (c) It changes to Waw, quiescent or sounded, in the Nif'al, Hif'il, Hof'al and Hithpa'el: נוֹדַע, יִוָּדַע, הוֹדִיעַ, הוּדַע, הִתְוַדַּע. (d) It is assimilated to the following consonat: יִצַּק.

b. a*]. The ending ת ֶ is afformed to compensate for the missing first radical, as in the פ״ן (גֶּשֶׁת).[207] According to my brother, לָלַת 1S 4:19 is for לָלֶדֶת (from ילד), cf. לָתֵת for לָתֶנֶת.[207a] Sometimes both the first radical and the afformative are retained, e. g. יְבֹשֶׁת Gn 8:7, יְכֹלֶת Nu 14:16.

c. b]. The Yod is omitted in the Infinitive in שׁוֹב תֵּשְׁבוּ Jr 42:10 and in כל תוכל Jb 42:2.[208]

* See Tables, pp. 130–131.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

d. c]. Before a Maḳḳef connecting with a tone-syllable the Ṣere changes to Segol, e. g. לֶךְ־נָא Gn 27:9, וְשֶׁב־שָׁם ibid 35:1; with ה ָ paragogicum: רְדָה Gn 45:9, לְכָה Nu 10:29, and with ה dropped orthographically: לְךָ ibid 23:13, Ju 19:13, 2 Chr 25:17, לֵכְןָ Ru 1:8 [in our text לֵכְנָה]; in pause the Ṣere is restored; רֵדָה 2K 1:9, וָלֵכָה 1S 23:27, שֵׁבוּ Jr 13:18. The form דְּעָה Pr 24:14 is for דֵּעָה[209] (conversely וְאֶשְׁעָה Ps 119:117 for וְאֶשְׁעָה).[210] The imperative of יהב is rather uniquely inflected, e. g. הַב, with ה paragogicum הָבָה (also הָבָה Gn 29:21, הָבִי, הָבוּ (also הַבוּ Hos 4:18),[211] הַבְנָה.

e. d]. The Ṣere in the second syllable changes to Pathaḥ before a laryngeal and in pause under the influence of the Waw consecutive, e. g. יֵדַע, יֵצַר Pr 4:12, וַיֵּרַד Ps 18:10 (cf., however, also תֵּשַׁם Ez 12:19 and יֵקַד Is 10:16, אַל־תּוֹסַף Jb 40:32). Upon the retraction of the tone the Ṣere changes to Segol: וַיֵּרֶד Ex 19:14. Thus, Ibn Janaḥ maintains, the Pathaḥ in pause can be traced back in all cases to Ṣere [see above § 16b].

f. e]. The radical Yod is retained in וַיִּיָּחֶל Gn 8:12 and יִיָּרֶה Ex 19:13. My father, however, [*Zik.* 45] regards these forms as Hithpa'el, instead of וַיִּתְיַחֵל and יִתְיָרֶה; for in the Nif'al, he contends, no analogous cases, with the radical Yod, occur, whereas in the Hithpa'el they do occur, e. g. וַיִּתְיַצְּבוּ Ex 19:17, וַיִּתְיַלְדוּ Nu 1:18, וַיִּתְיָעֲצוּ Ps 83:4.[212] As to וַיָּחֶל Gn 8:10, it is either Pi'el, with radical Yod missing as in וַיְבַשֵּׁהוּ Na 1:4 (cf. below, j), or more probably, Nif'al, on the analogy of וַנָּבֶל Is 64:5 (cf. supra § 34k).[213] It may, however, also be a regular Hif'il of חול, according to my father, which seems most plausible.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

K. WEAK VERBS

	Ḳal	Nif'al
Perf. Sing. 3m.	יָשַׁב	נוֹשַׁב
3f.	regular	נוֹשְׁבָה
2m.		נוֹשַׁבְתָּ
2f.		נוֹשַׁבְתְּ
1c.		נוֹשַׁבְתִּי
Plur. 3c.		נוֹשְׁבוּ
2m.		נוֹשַׁבְתֶּם
2f.		נוֹשַׁבְתֶּן
1c.		נוֹשַׁבְנוּ
Inf.	[a] יְסֹד, רֶשֶׁת, שֶׁבֶת, דֵּעָה	הִוָּשֵׁב
Inf. Absol.	[b] יָשׁוֹב	הִוָּשֵׁב
Imp. Sing. m.	יְרַשׁ, יְרֲשָׁה, [c] שֵׁב, דַּע	הִוָּשֵׁב
f.	יִרְשִׁי שְׁבִי	הִוָּשְׁבִי
Plur. m.	יִרְשׁוּ שְׁבוּ	הִוָּשְׁבוּ
f.	יְרַשְׁנָה שֵׁבְנָה	הִוָּשַׁבְנָה
Impf. Sing. 3m.	יִירַשׁ [d] יֵשֵׁב	• יִוָּשֵׁב
3f.	תִּירַשׁ תֵּשֵׁב	תִּוָּשֵׁב
2m.	תִּירַשׁ תֵּשֵׁב	תִּוָּשֵׁב
2f.	תִּירְשִׁי תֵּשְׁבִי	תִּוָּשְׁבִי
1c.	אִירַשׁ אֵשֵׁב	אִוָּשֵׁב
Plur. 3m.	יִירְשׁוּ יֵשְׁבוּ	יִוָּשְׁבוּ
3f.	תִּירַשְׁנָה תֵּשַׁבְנָה	[תִּוָּשַׁבְנָה]
2m.	תִּירְשׁוּ תֵּשְׁבוּ	תִּוָּשְׁבוּ
2f.	תִּירַשְׁנָה [תֵּשַׁבְנָה]	תִּוָּשַׁבְנָה
1c.	נִירַשׁ נֵשֵׁב	נִוָּשֵׁב
Shortened Impf. (Jussive) Impf. with Waw consec.	וַ יֵּ שֶׁ ב	
Part. act.	יֹשֵׁב	נוֹשָׁב
pass.	יָשׁוּב	

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

פ"י (for פ"ו) | 2. Verbs properly פ"י

Hif'il	Hof'al	Ḳal	Hif'il
הוֹשִׁיב	הוּשַׁב	יָטַב	הֵיטִיב
הוֹשִׁ֫יבָה	הוּשְׁבָה		הֵיטִ֫יבָה
הוֹשַׁ֫בְתָּ	הוּשַׁ֫בְתָּ		הֵיטַ֫בְתָּ
הוֹשַׁבְתְּ	הוּשַׁבְתְּ		הֵיטַבְתְּ
הוֹשַׁ֫בְתִּי	הוּשַׁ֫בְתִּי	regular	הֵיטַ֫בְתִּי
הוֹשִׁ֫יבוּ	הֽוּשְׁבוּ		הֵיטִ֫יבוּ
הֽוֹשַׁבְתֶּם	הֽוּשַׁבְתֶּם		הֱיטַבְתֶּם
הֽוֹשַׁבְתֶּן	הֽוּשַׁבְתֶּן		הֱיטַבְתֶּן
הוֹשַׁ֫בְנוּ	הוּשַׁ֫בְנוּ		הֵיטַ֫בְנוּ
הוֹשִׁיב	[1]הוּשַׁב	יְטֹב	הֵיטִיב
הוֹשֵׁב		יָטוֹב	הֵיטֵב
[2]הוֹשֵׁב			הֵיטֵב
הוֹשִׁ֫יבִי	wanting		הֵיטִ֫יבִי
הוֹשִׁ֫יבוּ			הֵיטִ֫יבוּ
הוֹשֵׁ֫בְנָה			[הֵיטֵ֫בְנָה]
[3]יוֹשִׁיב	יוּשַׁב	[1]יִיטַב	[3]יֵיטִיב
תּוֹשִׁיב	תּוּשַׁב	תִּיטַב	תֵּיטִיב
תּוֹשִׁיב	תּוּשַׁב	תִּיטַב	תֵּיטִיב
תּוֹשִׁ֫יבִי	תְּוּשְׁבִי	תִּֽיטְבִי	תֵּיטִ֫יבִי
אוֹשִׁיב	אוּשַׁב	אִיטַב	אֵיטִיב
יוֹשִׁ֫יבוּ	יֽוּשְׁבוּ	יִֽיטְבוּ	יֵיטִ֫יבוּ
[תּוֹשֵׁ֫בְנָה]	תּוּשַׁ֫בְנָה	תִּיטַ֫בְנָה	[תֵּיטֵ֫בְנָה]
תּוֹשִׁ֫יבוּ	תְּוּשְׁבוּ	תִּֽיטְבוּ	תֵּיטִ֫יבוּ
[תּוֹשֵׁ֫בְנָה]	[תּוּשַׁ֫בְנָה]	[תִּיטַ֫בְנָה]	[תֵּיטֵ֫בְנָה]
נוֹשִׁיב	נוּשַׁב	נִיטַב	[נֵיטִיב]
יוֹשֵׁב			יֵיטֵב
וַיּ֫וֹשֶׁב		וַיִּיטַב	וַיֵּ֫יטֶב
מוֹשִׁיב	הוּשַׁב	יטַב	מֵיטִיב
מוּשָׁב		יָטוֹב	

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

g. f]. It occurs with the feminine ending ֶ־ת: הֻלֶּדֶת Gn 40:20, הוּלֶּדֶת Ez 16:4, with Dagesh in the ל in place of the quiescent (Shureḳ), for although the Waw is retained orthographically, it is lost in pronunciation. Similarly נוּלְּדוּ 1Chr 3:5 and 20:8, מוּסָּד Is 28:16 and, after Yod quiescent, לִיסּוֹד 2Chr 31:7, with Dagesh in the middle radicals for the same reason.[214]

h. g.] Cf. also וְהוֹלֵיד Is 59:4, but before a laryngeal the Ṣere changes to Pathaḥ, e. g. הוֹדַע Ps 90:12. The form הוֹדַע Lv 4:23.28 does not belong to this category; it is Hof'al in place of הוּדַע like וְהוּרַד Nu 10:17.[215]

i. h]. This is apheretic for יְהוֹשִׁיב and יְהֵיטִיב. It occurs sometimes without apheresis, e. g. יְהוֹשִׁיעַ 1S 17:47 and Ps 116:6, יְהֵילִילוּ Is 52:5. In יְיֵלִילוּ Hos 7:14 (according to Ben Asher, יֵילִילוּ acc. to Ben Naftali), תְּיֵלִילוּ Is 65:4, יְיֵדָע Ps 138:6 and יְיֵטִיב Jb 24:21, the radical Yod takes the vowel of the rejected ה. In יְיֵלִיל Is 16:7 Ḥayyuj reads יֵילִיל [N. 26], while according to Ibn Janaḥ [*Riḳ* 28] the Ṣere under the radical Yod entails as latent quiescent another Yod, the first radical thus being doubled. This is, however, wrongly construed, for the Ṣere under the radical Yod is but the vowel of the rejected ה, the Hif'il characteristic.[216] The radical Yod is retained in אַיְסִירֵם Hos 7:12, יַיְשִׁירוּ Pr 4:25, and in the Imperatives הַיְשַׁר Ps 5:9 and הַיְצֵא [Ḳere] Gn 8:17. As to the form יוֹדַעְתִּי 1S 21:3, cf. supra § 26.

j. i]. The radical Yod is dropped in וַיֵּשַׁר 1S 18:26, וַיֵּבָשׁוּ Is 40:24, וְיֵבָשׁוּ Jb 12:15, etc. Similarly in the Pi'el וַיַּבְּשֵׁהוּ Na 1:4 [See above, f; also *Riḳ* 143 and the moderns Ges.-K. § 69u, Bauer-Leander 382, etc.)].

k. *Rem.* 1. The form יֵבוֹשׁ Is 29:22, יֵבֹשׁוּ Jr 6:15, and

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

יֵאֹותוּ Gn 34:22, are really derived from פ"י stems, as indicated by the Ṣere under the preformatives and by the Hif'il הוֹבַשְׁתָּ 2S 19:6 and הוֹבְאִישׁ Is 30:5 (with double quiescent א and י). The Waw after the Ḥolem in the second syllable is the regular Waw of prolongation in the יִפְעֹל formations, which is retained in this instance in order to compensate for the quiescing first radical; while in the strong verbs it is usually dropped, except in rare cases: יִשְׁפּוּטוּ Ex 18:26, תַּעֲבוּרִי Ru 2:8, תִּשְׁמוּרֵם Pr 14:3.[a] These verbs may also belong to the category of verbs kindred in form and meaning, which occur both as פ"י and ע"ו, e. g. יטב and טוב, יעף and עוף, יקץ and קוץ, יסך (יִיסָךְ Ex 30:22) and סוך (Dn 10:3), ישם (וַיִּישֶׂם Gn 50:26) and שים.[218] In the last two instances, however, the forms יִיסָךְ and וַיִּישֶׂם may be construed as Hof'al, in which the long Ḥireḳ is in place of Shureḳ.[219]

l. *Rem.* 2. There are a number of פ"י verbs in which the Yod does not quiesce but is assimilated to the following letter. These are: ינח (הִנִּיחַ 1Chr 16:21),[b] יסר (וְאֶסֳּרֵם Hos 10:10) and וְיִסְּרֵנִי Is 8:11;[c] יצב,[d] יצג; יצע; יצק (Is 44:3,

a. The forms עוּצוּ Is 8:10 [in our text עֻצוּ] and עֻצוּ Ju 19:30 may be similarly construed; namely, that the Shureḳ [or Ḳibbuṣ] is in place of Ḥolem and the initial radical is missing, the complete form being יְעוֹצוּ on the analogy of עִמְדוּ Na 2:9.[217]

b. The form וְהֻנִּיחָה Zc 5:11 is probably a forma mixta, composed of Hif'il הִנִּיחָה and Hof'al וְהֻנְּחָה.[220]

c. וְיִסְּרֵנִי may also be taken as Pi'el, with Ṣere under the ר in place of Pathaḥ [cf. above § 29c].

d. In וַתֵּתַצַּב Ex 2:4, which is Hithpa'el, in place of וַתִּתְיַצֵּב, the Dagesh in the צ, the characteristic of the intensive conjugation, allowed neither of assimilation of the missing Yod nor of its quiescing in a long vowel under the letter immediately preceding it. Hence, the Ṣere compensating for the missing Yod shifted back under the first ת.[221]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Gn 35:14, Nu 5:15, etc.);[a] יִצַּת; יִצַּר (Jr 1:5, Is 44:12);[b] also, once, יִנְּקוּ Dt 33:19 [in our text יִינָקוּ] and וַיִּשַּׁרְנָה 1S 6:12 [cf. below, note 230].

m. *Rem.* 3. Verbs whose initial radical is Yod and the final radical is Alef are, of course, affected by the rules governing both the פ"י and ל"א. The following peculiarities are to be noted in this category: שֶׁיּוֹצָא Ec 10:5 for שֶׁיּוֹצְאָה, הַיּוֹצֵת Dt 28:57 for הַיּוֹצֵאת, צֶאֱנָה Cn 3:11 [in our text צְאֶינָה] for צֵאנָה;[c] יְראוּ IS 12:24, with quiescence of א in order to differentiate it from יִרְאוּ (of ראה),[226] and לְרֹא 1S 18:29, with latent quiescence of the Yod (for לִירֹא).

a. Also וַיִּצַק 1K 22:35 and וַיִּצְקוּ ibid 18:34 [in our text וַיִּצְקוּ], in which case the Yod is not assimilated but quiesces in long Ḥirek, as indicated by the Metheg.[222] The Imperative of this verb occurs both with and without the Yod radical, e. g. צַק 2K 4:41 and יְצֹק Ez 24:3. In the Hif'il, likewise, the Yod either quiesces or assimilates, e. g. מוֹצָקֶת 2K 4:5, with Ḳameṣ under the צ on account of Pause, and וַיַּצִּקֻם Jos 7:23. The form צָקוּן Is 26:16 is either apheretic for יָצְקוּן like רֵד Ju 19:11 for יָרַד, with Nun paragogicum, or is to be taken with Isaac Ibn Chiquitila, quoted by Ibn Janaḥ, as a ע"ו verb, having the same meaning [cf. above, note 106].

b. This verb occurs also with Yod quiescent, וַיִּיצֶר Gn 2:7.19; and, in an entirely different meaning, יֵצֶר Gn 32:7, Pr 4:12, יֵצְרוּ Jb 18:7. These three forms are referred by Hayyuj [N. 52–53] to the ע"ו verbs, but in my opinion they belong to the פ"י category.[223]

c. This form is probably due, by the principle of assonance, to the influence of וּרְאֶנָה [in our text וּרְאֶינָה] immediately following it.[224] The Ṣere under the א of וּרְאֶנָה is intended to emphasize the distinction between *its* stem and that of צְאֶנָה. This principle operates also in מוֹצָאֲךָ וּמוֹבָאֲךָ 2S 3:25 (in place of מְבוֹאֲךָ) and in מַחְאֲךָ ... וְרַקְעֲךָ Ez 25:6 (cf. above § 31d), also in the talmudic form מָלִיחַ Ḥullin 113a (from מלח) under the effect of מָדִיחַ immediately preceding it [in our text מוֹלֵחַ, but see *Introduction* to *Riḳ*. VIII, note 2, by Kirchheim. The reading in our text was apparently tampered with by "grammarians"][225]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

n. *Rem.* 4. Of the verb יחם we find the following remarkable forms:[227] וַיֵּחַמְנָה Gn 30:39, on the analogy of וַיֵּרְדוּ, the difference in vowels being due to the middle laryngeal, as in the Pi'el יֶחֱמַתְנִי Ps 51:7;[228] יֵחַם 1K 1:1, in which the quiescent Yod radical is dropped, as in וַיִּשַׁר 1S 18:20;[229] וַיֵּחַמְנָה Gn 30:38, with the final plur. fem. afformative only;[230] הַנֵּחָמִים Is 57:5, analogous to הַנִּצָּבִים Gn 45:a, the Ṣere under the Nun compensating for the missing Dagesh in the second radical;[a 231] לְיַחְמֶנָּה Gn 30:41,[232] Infinitive Pi'el, with the pronominal suffix fem. sing. נָּה, as in תִּשְׁמְטֶנָּה Ex 23:11, תִּרְאֶינָּה Mi 7:10.[b] The Dagesh in the Nun in these instances is euphonic.

o. *Rem.* 5. Of the stem יזע two nominal forms exist: יֶזַע Ez 44:18 and זֵעָה, בְּזֵעַת Gn 3:19. The Ṣere in the latter form is retained in the inflexions, unlike the analogous formations of this type (שֵׁנָה, עֵצָה), on account of the laryngeal ע (cf. צֵאת Ez 4:12). In the Talmud the Hif'il of this stem is employed, e. g. מַזִיעִין and לְהַזִיעַ [cf. Shabb. 40a and 9b], on the analogy of מַטִיבִים and לְהַטִיב [מֵיטִיבִים and לְהֵיטִיב]. On this ground we may form the entire paradigm of this stem, namely הַזִיעַ, הֲזַעְתָּ, etc.[233]

p. *Rem.* 6. Verbs presenting other peculiarities are: יכל of which the Imperfect אוּכַל is either in place of אוֹכַל, in order to distinguish it from אֹכַל (of אכל);[234] or in place

a. This Ṣere may also be the regular vowel in which the Yod radical quiesces, as in אֵרַע, and in הֵיטִיב alongside of הוֹדִיעַ [cf. Ḥayyuj, N. 24].

b. The ending ־ֶנָּה may also be regarded as a plur. fem. pronominal suffix, with ה־ָ added as in אֹתָנָה Ex 35:26. The Ṣere under the מ in place of Kameṣ, characteristic of the Infinitive with suffixes, is analogous to that under the ד in רוֹדֵם Ps 68:28 [for רוֹדָם], just as we find Kameṣ instead of Ṣere in יְלַבְּשֵׁם Ex 29:33. [See above § 33g.]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

of אֲכֹל, to avoid confusing it with וַתֵּכֶל Ex 39:32 (of כלה); ילך the Perfect and Participle of which, except in the Hif'il, are derived from הלך, while the other tenses, with few exceptions, are inflected like פ"י verbs;[a] יסף, in a few instances of which we find in the Hif'il א in place of ו, e. g. תֹאסִיפוּן Ex 5:7, וַיֹּאסֶף 1S 18:29.[235a]

q. *Rem*. 7. The form יִרְטֵנִי Jb 16:11 is either derived from ירט, the Yod radical missing, on the analogy of יְצָרֵהוּ Is 44:12; or from רטה.[236] וְהוֹשְׁבוֹתִים Zc 10:6 is probably a mixed form, composed of וְהוֹשַׁבְתִּי (from ישב) and וַהֲשִׁיבוֹתִי (from שוב [So Ibn Janaḥ, *Riḳ*. 203, also Ges.-K. § 72x and Koenig I, 413 f.). Ibn Janaḥ includes among the פ"י forms וְיֶשְׁחֲךָ Mi 6:14, on the analogy וְיֶשְׁעֲךָ Ps 85:8,[237] and שְׁחִי Is 51:23.

§ 37. Verbs with Middle-Radical Quiescent (ע"ו, ע"י)[238]

a. In the ע"ו and ע"י verbs the middle radical quiesces in Ḳal, Nif'al, Hif'il and Hof'al, while in Pi'el and Pu'al it is preserved because of the characteristic Dagesh belonging to it.[b] In Po'el and Hithpa'el the third radical is doubled,[c] e. g. כּוֹנֵן and הִתְכּוֹנֵן.[240] A Pilpel conjugation

a. In the Hif'il the form הֵילִיכִי Ex 2:9, occurs alongside of the usual הוֹלִיכִי.[235] The Infinitive Ḳal of this verb, לֶכֶת is inflected with Segol under the ל, לֶכְתִּי, etc.

b. More frequently the Po'al form in the Pu'al sense is used, e. g. כּוֹנְנוּ Ez 28:13, חוֹלָלְתִּי Pr 8:24, יְחוֹלָלוּ Jb 26:5, יְרוֹפָפוּ ibid 11, also, according to my father, וְנוֹדַד Na 3:17 [*Ziḳ*. 55].[239]

c. The middle radical sometimes appears in the Hithpa'el, e. g. הִצְטַיַּדְנוּ Jos 9:12, וַיִּצְטַיָּרוּ ibid 4.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

also occurs, e. g. מְטַלְטֶלְךָ Is 22:17, עַרְעֵר Jr 51:58, וַיְפַרְפְּרֵנִי Jb 16:12, וַיְפַצְפְּצֵנִי ibid. Some ע"ו verbs are inflected like strong verbs, e. g. גוע, שוע, איב and all verbs whose third radical is a latent quiescent, soft ה, e. g. אוה, דוה, רוה היה, חיה].

b. a*]. The characteristic vowels in the second syllable of the פָּעַל, פָּעֵל, and פָּעֹל formations, respectively, are taken over by the first radical, or the monosyllabic stem. As to the Kameṣ, in place of Pathaḥ, in קָם, קָמָה, קָמוּ, it is due to the latent quiescent א, into which the middle radical has changed, the letters או"י being interchangeable, which appears orthographically in וְקָאם Hos 10:14, וְרָאֲמָה Zc 14:10[241]. In the remaining forms of the perfect Ḳal, however, the syllable being closed, the Pathaḥ is retained.[242]

c. b]. Under the influence of the Waw consecutive, the tone shifts forward to the afformatives, e. g. וְשַׁבְתָּ Dt 30:2, וְקַמְתָּ ibid 17:8, etc. The tone on the ultima in שַׁתָּה Ps 90:8 is due to the Dagesh in the ת and to its being followed in close connection by the laryngeal ע in the next word (עֲוֹנֹתֵינוּ).[243]

d. c]. There are several instances of this form in which the tone is on the ultima, e. g. שָׂמוּ Gn 40:15, תָּרוּ Nu 13:32, צָדוּ La 4:18 [in our text צָדוּ], רָשׁוּ Ps 34:11, etc. [cf. preceding note].

e. d]. The Ḥireḳ, in place of Pathaḥ, in וּפִשְׁתֶּם Mal 3:20, is on the analogy of וִירִשְׁתֶּם Dt 11:8, to which it would exactly correspond if its middle radical did not quiesce (וּפִישְׁתֶּם).[244]

f, e]. The imperative occurs also with Ḥolem instead of

* See Tables, pp. 138–139.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

WEAK VERBS ע״ו

	Ḳal	Nif'al	Hif'il
Perf. Sing. 3m.	[a]בּוֹשׁ [a]מֵת [a]קָם	[e]נָקוֹם	[k]הֵקִים
3f.	בּוֹשָׁה מֵתָה קָמָה	נָקוֹמָה	הֵקִימָה
2m.	בּוֹשְׁתָּ מַתָּה [b]קַמְתָּ	[h]נְקוּמוֹתָ	הֲקִימוֹתָ
2f.	מַתְּ קַמְתְּ	נְקוּמוֹת	הֲקִימוֹת
1c.	מַתִּי קַמְתִּי etc.	נְקוּמוֹתִי	הֲקִימוֹתִי
Plur. 3c.	מֵתוּ [c]קָמוּ	נָקוֹמוּ	הֵקִימוּ
2m.	בָּשְׁתֶּם מַתֶּם [d]קַמְתֶּם	נְקוּמוֹתֶם	הֲקִימוֹתֶם
2f.	מַתֶּן קַמְתֶּן	נְקוּמוֹתֶן	[הֲקִימוֹתֶן]
1c.	מַתְנוּ קַמְנוּ	נְקוּמוֹנוּ	הֲקִימוֹנוּ
Inf.	(With suffixed קוּם בֹּאָה,ـָה IK 14:12,	הִקּוֹם	[l]הָקִים
Inf. absol.	רֹעָה Is 24:19) קוֹם	הִקּוֹם	הָקֵם
Imp. Sing. m.	אוֹר [i]קוּם	הִקּוֹם	הָשֵׁב הָקֵם
f.	אוֹרִי קוּמִי	[הִקּוֹמִי]	הָקִימִי
Plur. m.	אוֹרוּ קוּמוּ	הִקּוֹמוּ	הָקִימוּ
f.	אוֹרְנָה קֹמְנָה		[הָקֵמְנָה]
Impf. Sing. 3m.	[j]יָקוּם יָבוֹא	[l]יִקּוֹם	[m]יָקִים
3f.	תָּקוּם	תִּקּוֹם	תָּקִים
2m.	תָּקוּם	תִּקּוֹם	תָּקִים
2f.	תָּקוּמִי	תִּקּוֹמִי	תָּקִימִי
1c.	אָקוּם	אֶקּוֹם	אָקִים
Plur. 3m.	יָקוּמוּ	יִקּוֹמוּ	יָקִימוּ
3f.	תְּקוּמֶינָה תָּשֹׁבְנָה		תְּקִימֶינָה, תָּקֵמְנָה
2m.	תָּקוּמוּ	תִּקּוֹמוּ	תָּקִימוּ
2f.	תְּקוּמֶינָה		[תָּקֵמְנָה]
1c.	נָקוּם	נִקּוֹם	נָקִים
Shortened Impf.	יָקֹם		יָקֵם
Impf. with Waw consec	וַיָּקָם (Pause וַיָּקֹם		וַיָּקֶם
Impf. with Suff.	יְשׁוּפֵנִי		יְקִימֵנִי
Part. act.	טוֹב מֵת קָם	נָקוֹם נָסוֹג נָצוּר נָכוֹן	מֵקִים
pass.	קוּם, in case of transitive verbs.	נְצוּרָה [i]נְכוֹנָה	מוּקָם [m]הוּכָן

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

VERBS ע״ו [Weak Verbs ע״י]

Hof'al	Pōlēl	Pōlal	Ḳal	Nif'al	Hif'il
הוּקַם	קוֹמֵם	קוֹמַם			
[הוּקְמָה	קוֹמְמָה	[קוֹמְמָה]			
הוּקַמְתָּ	קוֹמַמְתָּ	קוֹמַמְתָּ			
הוּקַמְתְּ	[קוֹמַמְתְּ]	[קוֹמַמְתְּ]			
[הוּקַמְתִּי	קוֹמַמְתִּי	קוֹמַמְתִּי			
הוּקְמוּ	קוֹמְמוּ	קוֹמְמוּ			
[הוּקַמְתֶּם	[קוֹמַמְתֶּם	קוֹמַמְתֶּם			
הוּקַמְתֶּן	קוֹמַמְתֶּן	קוֹמַמְתֶּן			
[הוּקַמְנוּ	[קוֹמַמְנוּ	[קוֹמַמְנוּ			
הוּקַם	קוֹמֵם				בִּין [cf. note בֹּן 251]
		wanting			בִּין בִּינִי בִּינוּ

Shureḳ, e. g. צוּר Is 8:16, וָדוֹשִׁי Mi 4:13. In the lengthened form the tone frequently remains on the stem-syllable, e. g. חוּסָה Joel 2:17, חוּשָׁה Ps 38:23. There are. however, numerous instances with the tone on the affixed syllable, e. g. עוּרָה הַנֵּבֶל Ps 57:9 [in our text עוּרָה], קוּמָה Nu 10:35; also all cases of קוּמָה in Psalms, except וְקוּמָה Ps 35:2, סוּרָה Ju 4:18, שׁוּבָה Is 44:22, etc. [Cf. however, above c and d, also note 243].

g. f]. The Ḳameṣ under the preformatives is to compensate for the missing middle radical [cf. above, note 96], the Waw in the second syllable being, not the middle radical, but the Waw of Prolongation [vowel-letter], which is usually latent in the strong verbs (יִשְׁמֹר, יִשְׁפֹּט, but יִשְׁפּוּטוּ Ex 18:26).[245] This Waw is preserved (except in a few cases of יָקֻם, יָשֻׁב, יְקֻמוּ, יָשֻׁבוּ), because of the Shureḳ, to which the Ḥolem is changed. The reason for this change of vowels is the need to differentiate the Imperfect of the ע"ו from that of the ע"ע (יָסֹב יָחֹן, etc.). This Shureḳ, therefore, changes back to Ḥolem under the influence of the Waw consecutive in pause וַיָּמֹת Gn 5:5, while without pause, upon loss of the tone, the Ḥolem in turn changes to Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf, e. g. וַיָּקָם, תָּשָׁב־נָא 1K 17:21, on the analogy of יַעֲבָר־ Gn 33:14, אֶכְתָּב־ Hos 8:12. When the last syllable has a laryngeal or a ר, it takes Pathaḥ,[246] e. g. וַיָּעַף Ju 4:21 (but וַיָּעָף Is 6:6, to distinguish it from the former in meaning), וַיַּעַט 1S 25:14, וַתַּחַשׁ Jb 31:5 (this may also be a ל"ה verb, with two stems of the same meaning, like יבשׁ and בושׁ cf. above § 36K and note 218), וַתָּנַח Gn 8:4, וַיָּסַר Ju 4:18, but וַתָּחָס 1S 24:11 and Ez 20:17.

h. g]. Here, likewise, the Ḳameṣ may be regarded as

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

compensating for the missing radical, and the Waw in the second syllable as Waw of Prolongation, the form being of פָּעֻל formation, on the analogy of וְנַחְתּוֹם Es 8:8, וְנִשְׁלוֹחַ ibid 3:13. However, since this is the only existing form, there being no instance corresponding to פָּעַל or פָּעֵל formations, the Waw is probably to be taken, with Ḥayyuj [N. 39], as the middle radical, the quiescence of which influences the preceding vowel to be lengthened to Ḳameṣ.[247] The Ṣere under the preformative in נֵעוֹר Zc 2:17 is, according to Ḥayyuj [ibid.], Ibn Janaḥ [*Opusc.* 98 f.] and the other grammarians, in place of Ḳameṣ, on account of the laryngeal ע. This does not, however, seem plausible in view of נָאוֹר Ps 76:5, where the א has no effect on the Ḳameṣ. Ḥayyuj and Ibn Janaḥ are at variance with regard to the etymology of this form. The former takes it as Nif'al of עור, while according to the latter it is to be referred to the Ḳal of פ"ן stem [on the analogy of קָטֹן], cf. נָעֲרוּ Jr 51:38.[248]

i. h]. The first Ḥolem is changed here to Shureḳ in order to preserve the Waw; also for the sake of euphony [dissimilation], to avoid the concurrence of two Ḥolems. But this Ḥolem is preserved in נְפוֹצוֹתֶם Ez 11:17, etc., נְקוֹטוֹתֶם ibid 43:36 [On the Ḥolem of the third radical see below § 38b and note 271a].

j. i]. Before a laryngeal or ר, the preformative takes Ṣere to compensate for the missing Dagesh, e. g.: יֵעוֹרוּ Joel 4:12, וַיֵּאוֹר 2S 2:32, תֵּרוֹץ Ez 29:7. So also the infinitive לֵאוֹר Job 33:30 for לְהֵאוֹר.

k. j]. The tone is here on the ultima; hence, the Ḳameṣ of the preformative is changed to Shewa, because of its remoteness from the tone. This distinguishes the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

participle from the Perfect נָכוֹנָה. Similarly נִשְׁבָּרָה Ps 15:19 (participle) as against the pausal Perfect נִשְׁבָּרָה. The form נָפוֹצָת 2S 18:8 is on the analogy of נִשְׁבָּרֶת, with the tone on the penultima, hence the Ḳameṣ is retained.[249]

l. k]. The Ṣere under the characteristic preformative, which compensates for the missing middle radical [actually lengthened from Ḥireḳ because of its being in an open syllable and near the tone] is preserved in a number of instances in this conjugation, e. g. וְהֵטַלְתִּי Jr 22:26, וְהֵמַתָּ Nu 14:15, הֵכַנּוּ 2Chr 29:19. More frequently, however, the Ṣere is changed to Ḥaṭef Pathaḥ, particularly with pronominal suffixes and to Pathaḥ, before a laryngeal, e. g. וַהֲבֵאתָהּ Dt 21:12, וַהֲבֵאתוֹ 2S 14:10, הֲבֵאתִיהָ Is 37:26, וַהֲקֵאתוֹ Pr 25:16, etc.; הַעִידֹתִי Dt 4:26, הַעִירוֹתִי Is 41:25, also in the ע"ע verbs הַחִלּוֹתִי 1S 22:15 and הַחִתּוֹתָ Is 9:3 [on the Ḥolem in the third radical see below, note 271a]. Instances with Ḥaṭef Segol under the preformative also occur, e. g. הֱשִׁיבֹנוּ Gn 44:8, הֱכִינוֹתִי 1Chr 29:19 [in our text הֲכִינוֹתִי], הֱטִיבוֹתָ 2Chr 6:8, הֱקִיצוֹתִי Ps 139:18. The forms הֲמִתֶּם Nu 17:6, וַהֲמִתֶּם 2S 13:28, וַהֲמִתֶּן Ex 1:16, וַהֲמִתִּיו 1S 17:35, וַהֲמִתִּיהָ Hos 2:5, are analogous to the הֲקִימוֹתִי formations, in which the third radical is assimilated to the afformative on account of the concurrence of the two ת's. Ibn Janaḥ, however, regards the last instances as derived from the types הֵמַתִּי, הֵמַתֶּם in which the Ṣere changes to Ḥaṭef Pathaḥ on account of the pronominal suffixes, as in וַהֲבֵאתָהּ Dt 21:12, הֲבֵאתִיהָ Is 37:26, etc. The form וְהֵטִיבוֹתִי Ez 36:11 is a combination either of the two formations (הֲקִימוֹתִי and הֵטַלְתִּי) or of the two verbs טוב and יטב.[250] In the forms רִיבוֹתָ Jb 33:13, בִּינֹתִי Dan 9:2

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

and וְדִינוּם Jr 16:16, the characteristic ה is missing. In the latter instance the form וְדִינוּם may be taken as Pi'el in which the Yod quiesced in long Ḥireḳ.[251]

m. l]. With suffixed feminine ָה–, לַהֲנָפָה Is 30:28.[251a] With pronominal suffixes the vowel in the first syllable changes to Ḥaṭef Pathaḥ or to Ḥaṭef Segol, e. g. הֲקִימוֹ Jr 23:20, הֲסִירְךָ 2S 5:6. Similarly, in the Perfect: וַהֲשִׁיבְךָ Gn 40:13 and וֶהֱשִׁיבְךָ Dt 28:68. In לְהַפְרְכֶם Lv 26:15, in place of לַהֲפִירְכֶם, the change of vowels is for the sake of euphony.[252]

n. m]. With Waw consecutive, upon the retraction of the tone, the Ḥireḳ in the second syllable changes to Segol, e. g. וַיָּקֶם 1K 8:20, וַיָּטֶל 1S 20:33 (but once וַתָּרֶץ Ju 9:53). With a laryngeal or ר in the last syllable, the middle radical takes, as in Ḳal, Pathaḥ, e. g. וַיָּעַד Zc 3:6, וַתָּגַח Ez 32:2, וַתָּסַר Gn 38:14 (but וַיָּחֶל 1S 31:3).

o. n]. The form הוּכָן Is 30:33 [in our text הוּכָן] is probably the Hof'al participle, as indicated by the participle עָרוּךְ in the first part of the sentence.

p. The following peculiarities in the ע"ו verbs deserve special consideration:

(a) The long vowel of the Preformative is sometimes changed to a short vowel followed by Dagesh,[253] e. g. הִזִּילוּהָ La 1:8, הִסִּיתוּךָ Jr 38:22, יַסִּית Is 36:18, וַיַּלִּינוּ Nu 14:36, מַלִּינִים Ex 16:8, וְהֻסַּג Is 59:14.

(b) The Ḥolem and the Shureḳ frequently interchange, e. g. יָדֹן Gn 6:3 [in our text יָדוֹן],[a] for יָדוּן; יָשֹׁב Ec 12:7;

a. In all such cases of the Imperfect with Ḥolem, the Waw of Prolongation is dropped. The form יָדֹן (for יָדוֹן) may also be traced to the stem נדן.[253a]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

תְּרֹם Mi 5:8; כְּהִדּוּשׁ Is 52:10, Nif'al Infinitive, for כְּהִדּוֹשׁ;[a] הַלּוֹט ibid 25:7, for הַלּוּט, passive participle,[b] וּתְפוֹצוֹתִיכֶם Jr 25:34.[c] So also חֻשִׁים Nu 32:17, סוּרָה Is 49:21, סוּרֵי Jr 2:21, וְסוּרַי ibid 17:13, סוּרֵי ibid 2:21, שׁוּבֵי Mi 2:8, כְּדֻמָה Ez 27:32 [in our text כְּדֻמָּה, see Ḳimḥi's commentary ad loc., also Ibn Janaḥ, *Riḳ*. 87], דוּמָה Ps 94:17, בְּשׁוּרַי ibid 92:12; all of which are active participles or adjectives of the פָּעוֹל formation (cf. [יָכוֹל], גָּדוֹל, etc.), in which the Ḥolem is replaced by Shureḳ; cf. טוֹב, קוֹמִים 2K 16:7, גּוֹחִי Ps 71:6, גּוֹחִי ibid. 22:10, רוֹעָה Pr 25:19.[d]

q. Rem. 1. In וְהַזּוּרֶה Is 59;5, the Segol under the ר is in place of Ḳameṣ, the form being a fem. passive participle, on the analogy of שׂוּמָה 2S 13:32. Similarly וְלָנֶה Zc 5:4 is in place of וְלָנָה [Ḥayyuj, N. 46].[e]

r. *Rem*. 2. The form זֹרוּ Is 1:6, is Ḳal of the פָּעֵל formation, like טֹבוּ, and is intransitive;[259] although וַיָּזַר Ju 6:38 and תְּזוּרֶהָ Jb 39:15 of the same conjugation are transitive. Verbs occurring both in the transitive and intransitive meaning in the same conjugation are not uncommon in Hebrew [see below § 81 f].

a. The form אֶדוּשׁ Is 28:28 is Infinitive Ḳal with prefixed (prosthetic) א.[254]

b. The Ḥolem in this instance is due to the influence of the Ḥolem in the preceding הַלּוֹט, which is a noun [cf. above, note 224].[255] In both instances, however, the Waw is not the second radical, but Waw of Prolongation [cf. above, g].

c. This noun is of the same formation as וּתְשׁוּבֹתֵיכֶם Jb 21:34.[256] The Ḥireḳ under the ת in place of Ṣere is on the analogy of שֵׁרִיתִךָ Jr 15:11.[257] Under the effect of the Ḥolem in the צ, the Shureḳ of the פ changed to Ḥolem by assimilation, as in the case of הֹרוֹ וְהֹגוֹ Is 59:13 and, conversely, in that of יְכַסְיֻמוּ, Ex 15:5 for יְכַסְיֻמוּ.[258] [See above §36m]

d. The Waw in all these instances is not the radical but is Waw of Prolongation, as in גָּדוֹל.[258a]

e. But לָנִים Ne 13:21, is of the פָּעֵל formation, on the analogy of מֵת.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

s. *Rem*. 3. The verbs בּוא, נוא, קוא, are doubly weak in that they suffer modifications characteristic of both the ע״ו and ל״א verbs. The Perfect: בָּא, בָּאָה, בָּאתָ, בָּאת, בָּאתִי, בָּאוּ (also once בָּאוּ Jr 27:18 on the analogy of טֹובוּ),[260] בָּאנוּ, בָּאתֶם (once בָּנוּ 1S 25:8); Infintive: בּוֹא, (בֹּאֶנָה Ru 1:19 for בֹּאןָ, with afformed ה, like לְבַדְּנָה Gn 21:29); Imperative: בֹּא, בֹּאִי, בֹּאוּ (but וּקְיוּ Jr 25:27, with third radical Alef changed to Yod; or more probably it is to be referred to the stem קָאָה Lv 18:28, or קָיָה); Imperfect: יָבֹא etc., תְּבֹאנָה or תְּבֹאֶינָה.

t. *Rem*. 4. In תָּבֹואתָה Dt 33:16 the termination תָה is pleonastic as in הָחְבְּאַתָה Josh 6:17 [in our text הֶחְבְּאָתָה, cf. below § 39g], נִפְלְאַתָה 2S 1:26, and in nouns, יְשׁוּעָתָה Ps 3:3; the tense being Imperfect (תָּבוֹא). In my opinion, however, all such affixed terminations are indicative of frequency or intensity. וַתָּבוֹאתִי 1S 25:34, combines the two readings וַתָּבֹאִי and בָּאת; תְּבוֹאָתְךָ Jb 22:21 is either a combination of תָּבֹא and בָּאָה [cf. *Rik*. 199], or it may be an Imperfect, like וְתָבוֹאָה Is 5:19, in which the suffixed ה is changed to ת.[261]

u. *Rem*. 5. The Hif'il forms of בּוֹא are: הֵבִיא, הֲבֵיאתָ (with quiescent middle radical) 2K 9:2 and Is 43:23, וְהֲבֵיאתִי Nu 14:31, שֶׁהֲבֵיאתִיו Cn 3:4; also הֲבֵאתָ etc., or הֱבִיאוֹתָ etc. The Alef is omitted in אָבִי Mi 1:15, מֵבִי Jr 19:15, יָנִי Ps 141:5. In the Hof'al we find the form הוּבָאת [in our text הֻבָאת] Gn 33:11 for הוּבָאָה [הוּבְאָה]; cf. above § 22b.

v. *Rem*. 6. Other remarkable formations of the ע״י verbs are יְעַלְעוּ Jb 39:30, in place of יְלוֹעֲעוּ;[262] יְעוֹעֵרוּ Is 15:5, in which the first, instead of the third, radical is doubled;[263] לֹוצְצִים Hos 7:5, which is either an adjectival

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

noun, or a Po'el participle with the characteristic מ preformative missing, like וְנוֹצְצִים Ez 1:7 and וּבִתְקוֹמְמֶיךָ Ps 139:21 for מְנוֹצְצִים and וּבְמִתְקוֹמְמֶיךָ;[a] וְיָנֵאץ Ec 12:5, in which the Waw middle radical changed to Alef;[265] הַסַּתָּה 1K 21:25, with the Dagesh in the ת compensating, according to Ḥayyuj, Ibn Janaḥ and my father, for the feminine ending ת, the form thus having a double fem. ending, like הֶחְבְּאַתָה Josh 6:17;[b] [266] אֲרוֹמָם Is 33:10, which is, according to Ḥayyuj [N. 55], in place of אֶתְרוֹמָם;[c] and, according to Ibn Janaḥ [*Opusc.* 223], a Nif'al of ע"ע, without assimilation of either of the radicals; וְתִכּוֹנֵן Nu 21:27 with the assimilation of the preformative [see, however, above § 35c and note 196]; יֵשׁוֹב 2S 15:8, which is, according to Ḥayyuj [N. 57], an instance of the transposition of the first and the second radicals, like יְרִיבַי Ps 35:1;[d] [268] שַׁתּוּ Ps 49:15 and ibid 37:9, in place of שָׁתוּ ibid 3:7, with Dagesh compensating for the long vowel.[e]

a. Some, however, regard וּבִתְקוֹמְמֶיךָ also as an adjectival noun and include in the same category the form תְּחוֹלֶלְכֶם Is 51:2.[264] The latter, however, cannot be taken as an adjectival noun, since it modifies the proper noun שָׂרָה; it would, therefore require the fem. characteristic (תְּחוֹלֶלְתְּכֶם). It should rather be construed as an Imperfect in place of Perfect, of the Po'el formation.

b. The Dagesh in this case may also be regarded as compensating for the regular long vowel under the first radical, הַסְּיתָה or הַסַּתָּה.[267]

c. Ḥayyuj attributes to the same category the forms וַיֵּרוֹמּוּ Ez 10:15 and הֵרוֹמּוּ Nu 17:10. Cf., however, below § 38m.

d. But in both these cases the Yod may be a prefix, which is common in nouns, like יָקוּם, יְבוּל, יְחוּר, יַעֲקֹב, etc. Ḥayyuj regards also בְּשִׁיבָתוֹ 2S 19:33 as ע"ו, but my father takes it as פ"י, in place of בְּיִשִׁיבָתוֹ, in which the Yod is omitted.

e. Some grammarians, however, take it as a ע"ע verb.[269]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

§ 38. Verbs ע"ע, סבב [cf. above, note 81]

a. In the ע"ע verbs the middle radical is dropped in most of the inflexions. There are, however, numerous instances in which these verbs follow the analogy of the strong verbs, e. g. וְסָבַב 1S 7:16, וְחוֹגְגִים ibid. 30:16, בָּזַזְנוּ Dt 2:35, וְהָמַם Is 28:28, לַחְמָם ibid. 47:14, זָמַמְתִּי Za 8:14.15, הַרְנִינוּ Dt 32:43, וְהַחִתֹּתִי Jr 49:37, בַּעֲזוֹז Pr 8:28, etc. An א or נ is sometimes introduced to compensate for the missing radical,[27e] e. g. בָּזְאוּ Is 18:2.7, יִמָּאֲסוּ Ps 58:8, וַיִּמָּאֵס Jb 7:5, תִּמָּלֵא ibid 15:32, תָּמְנוּ La 3:22, תָּמְנוּ Ps 64:7 (see below, c), מָעֻזְנֶיהָ Is 23:11.[a]

b. In the Ḳal, the Pathaḥ of the ground-form פָּעַל is retracted under the first radical after the elision of the second radical, under which it normally belongs, e. g. תַּם La 4:22, פַּסּוּ Ps 12:3, etc. (but also וּמָךְ Lv 25:47, which Ibn Janaḥ [Opusc. 83 f.] refers to the ע"ו, but see יָמֹכּוּ Ps 106:43 and יִמַּךְ Ec 10:18.). There are also instances of the פָּעֵל formation, e. g. רֹמּוּ Jb 24:24, וָרֹבּוּ Gn 49:23.[b] This formation is employed, likewise, before the afformative of the 1st and 2nd persons, e. g. בַּזּוֹנוּ Dt 3:7, דַּלּוֹנוּ Ps 79:8, וְסַבּוֹתִי Ec 2:20, שַׁלּוֹתָ Hab 2:8.[271a] The tone is regularly mil'el throughout the Perfect, but examples of milra' also occur, e. g. וְרַבָּה Ex 23:29 (with Waw consecutive), רַכּוּ Ps 55:22, etc.

a. Examples of נ replacing also ה are: פּוּנִי Nu 26:23, שֵׁלָנִי ibid 26:20, שִׁילוֹנִי 1K 11:29, נְדָנַיִךְ Ez 16:33, from פֻּוָּה, שֵׁלָה, שִׁילֹה, and נֵדָה. וְקָבְנוֹ Nu 23:3 (for וְקָבְבוֹ) may also belong here (but see above, § 32d).

b. Ḥayyuj [N. 116] regards the latter as Polel formation in place of וְרֹבְבוּ.[271]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

c. The forms תְּמַנוּ Nu 17:28 and La 3:22 [תַּמְנוּ] are abnormal for תַּמְּנוּ. My father, however, refers these to the ע״ו verbs, on the analogy of קַמְנוּ to which belongs also the Hif'il כַּהֲתִימְךָ Is 33:1; while the Nun in תַּמְנוּ La 3:22 and Ps 64:7 [תַּמְנוּ] is, according to Ibn Janaḥ, in place of Mem.[272]

d. In the Imperfect, the missing radical is compensated either by the lengthened vowel of the Preformative, as in the ע״ו, יָסֹב [cf. above, note 96], or by Dagesh in the first radical. Ibn Janaḥ [*Opusc.* 198 ff.] regards as Ḳal of ע״ע also the forms אֵיתָם Ps 19:15, יֵמַר Is 24:9, Gn וָאֵקַל 16:5, וַתֵּקַל ibid. 4 [cf. above, note 96]. These, however, as well as those of יִסֹּב formation may be taken as Nif'al wherever they are not transitive in meaning. My father [*Zik.* 42] refers all such forms as אֶקֹּב Nu 23:8 יִשֹּׁם Jr 49:17, יִדְּמוּ Ex 15:16, וַיִּתְּמוּ Dt 32:8, וְנִדְּמָה Jr 8:14, to the פ״ן verbs.[a] [273]

e. a*]. The Ḥolem is sometimes changed to Shureḳ, וְלָבוּר Ec 9:1, or to Ḳibbuṣ, before suffixes, לְהֻמָּם Es 9:24; also to Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf, the kindred vowel of the Ḳibbuṣ, which is lengthened to Ḳameṣ in לְבָרָם Ec 3:18 to compensate for the Dagesh required by the ר.[274] The infinitive also occurs in the פְּעַל formation, e. g. לְרַד Is 45:1, כְּשַׁךְ Jr 5:26, and with suffixed ת,[274a] שַׁמּוֹת Ez 36:3, חַנּוֹת Ps 77:10,

a. Similarly יִסַּם Dt 20:8 is derived, according to him, from נסם and is Ḳal of the יִפַּעַל formation, as evidenced by the fact that it is followed by the preposition אֵת designating the definite accusative. This form may, however, be construed as Nif'al, the particle אֵת not being a *nota accusativi*, but introducing an explanatory addition, as in יֵחָלֵק אֶת הָאָרֶץ Nu 26:55 [cf. below § 74a and note 613].

* See tables, pp. 150–151.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

חַלּוֹתִי ibid :11. בְּהִלּוֹ Jb 29:3 is on the analogy of וּבְפִתְחוֹ Ne 8:5 in the strong verbs. [See above § 31d].[275]

f. b]. This Ḥolem changes to Ḳibbuṣ before ה Paragogicum, עֻזָּה Ps 68:29; and, occasionally, to Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf, e. g. גָּזִּי Jr 7:29, רָנּוּ ibid 31:6 and Is 44:23, רָנִּי Zc 2:14. In קָבָה־לִּי Nu 22:11, 17, and אָרָה־לִּי ibid 22:6, 23:7, the Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf is lengthened to Ḳameṣ because of the omission of the Dagesh in the following letter, as in לְבָרָם, see above, e. Ḥayyuj, however [N. 106], regards it as Pi'el for אָרְרָה.[276] On וְקָבְנוֹ Nu 23:13 see above § 32c.

g. c]. Upon the loss of the tone by the following syllable, the Ḳameṣ is reduced to Shewa. The Ḥolem in the second syllable changes to Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf, under the influence of the Waw consecutive,[a] except in pause, e. g. וַיָּהָם Ju 4:15, וַיִּחָם 2K 4:34, (but וַיָּהֹם 2S 22:15). A Shureḳ occurs sometimes in place of Ḥolem e. g. יָרוּן Pr 29:6, יָשׁוּד Ps 91:6, יָמוּךְ Lv 25:35 (see, however, above, b).

h. d]. In קָבֹה Nu 23:8, the Waw is replaced by Hē [cf. above § 7t]. In the Imperative and Imperfect with suffixes the Ḳibbuṣ is frequently changed to Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf, e. g. חָקָּהּ Is 30:8 and יְסֻכֻּהוּ Jb 40:22; but also סֹלּוּהָ Jr 50:26, חָנֻּנִי Jb 19:21, יְבֻזּוּם Ze 2:9, יְחָנֵּנוּ Ps 67:2,[b] יְשָׁדֵּם Pr 11:3 and its peculiar equivalent יְשָׁדְדֵם Jr 5:6 (unless it be a Po'el like יְשׁוֹדֵד Hos 10:2).[279] On the unusual Infinitive form בְּהִלּוֹ Jb 29:3, see above, e.

a. The Ḳibbuṣ in וַיָּרֻם Ex 16:20 is to avoid confusing it with וַיָּרָם Ez 10:4 (from רום).[277]

b. The form יָחְנְךָ Gn 43:29 and Is 30:19 is in place of יְחָנְּךָ, the Ḳameṣ having retracted to the preformative, thus causing the loss of the Dagesh in the Nun.[278]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

G. VERBS MEDIAE GEMINATAE

	Ḳal		Nif'al
Perf. Sing. 3m.	סָבַב, תַּם		[f] נָסַב, נָמַס, נָגֹל
3f.	סָבֲבָה, תַּמָּה		נָסַבָּה, נָסַבָּה, נָגֹלָּה
2m.	סַבּוֹתָ		נְסַבּוֹתָ
2f.	סַבּוֹת		נְסַבּוֹת
1c.	סַבּוֹתִי		נְסַבּוֹתִי
Plur. 3c.	סָבֲבוּ, תַּמּוּ		נָסַבּוּ, נָסַבּוּ, נָגֹלּוּ
2m.	סַבּוֹתֶם		נְסַבּוֹתֶם
2f.	סַבּוֹתֶן		נְסַבּוֹתֶן
1c.	סַבּוֹנוּ		[g] נְסַבּוֹנוּ
Inf.	[a] סֹב		הִסַּב
Inf. absol.	סָבוֹב		הִמֵּס, הִסּוֹב
Imp. Sing. m.	[b] סֹב		הִסַּב
f.	סֹבִּי		הִסַּבִּי
Plur. m.	סֹבּוּ		הִסַּבּוּ, הִבָּרוּ
f.	[סֻבֶּינָה]		[הִסַּבֶּינָה]
Impf. Sing. 3m.	[c] יָסֹב	יִסֹּב	[h] יִסַּב, יִסֹּב, יֵקַל
3f.	תָּסֹב	תִּסֹּב	תִּסַּב
2m.	תָּסֹב	תִּסֹּב	תִּסַּב
2f.	תָּסֹבִּי	תִּסְּבִי	תִּסַּבִּי
1c.	אָסֹב	אֶסֹּב	אֶסַּב
Plur. 3m.	יָסֹבּוּ	יִסְּבוּ	[i] יִסַּבּוּ
3f.	תְּסֻבֶּינָה	[תִּסֹּבְנָה]	תִּמַּקְנָה [תִּסַּבֶּינָה]
2m.	תָּסֹבּוּ	תִּסְּבוּ	תִּסַּבּוּ
2f.	תְּסֻבֶּינָה	תִּסֹּבְנָה	תִּסַּבֶּינָה
1c.	נָסֹב	נִסֹּב	נִסַּב
Impf. with Waw consec.	וַיָּסָב (pause וַיָּסֹב)		
Impf. and Perfect with Suff.	יְסֻבֵּנִי	[d] סַבּוּ	
Part. act.	סֹבֵב	[e] תָּם	[j] נָסָב, נָקַל
			[fem. נְסַבָּה]
			נְשַׁמָּה
pass.	סָבוּב		נְסַבָּה
			נְמַקִּים
			נְמַקּוֹת

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

OR DOUBLE ע

Hif'il	Hof'al	Po'el	Po'al
הֵסֵב, הֵסַב	הוּסַב	סוֹבֵב, עוֹלֵל	סוֹבַב
הֵסַבָּה	הוּסַבָּה	סֽוֹבֲבָה	[סוֹבֲבָה
[14]הֲסִבּוֹתָ	[הוּסַבּוֹתָ	סוֹבַבְתָּ	סוֹבַבְתָּ
הֲסִבּוֹת	הֽוּסַבּוֹת	סוֹבַבְתְּ	סוֹבַבְתְּ
הֲסִבּוֹתִי	הוּסַבּוֹתִי]	סוֹבַבְתִּי	סוֹבַבְתִּי
הֵסַבּוּ, הֵחַלּוּ	הוּסַבּוּ	סֽוֹבֲבוּ	סוֹבֲבוּ
הֲסִבּוֹתֶם	[הֽוּסַבּוֹתֶם	סֽוֹבַבְתֶּם	סוֹבַבְתֶּם
הֲסִבּוֹתֶן	הוּסַבּוֹתֶן	סוֹבַבְתֶּן	סוֹבַבְתֶּן
הֲסִבּוֹנוּ	הוּסַבּוֹנוּ]	סוֹבַבְנוּ	סוֹבַבְנוּ]
[15]הָסֵב	[16]הָשַׁמָּה	סוֹבֵב	[סוֹבַב] עוֹלֵל
הָסֵב		סוֹבֵב	
הָסֵב		סוֹבֵב	
הָסֵבִּי	wanting	[סוֹבְבִי	wanting
הָסֵבּוּ		סוֹבְבוּ	
[הֲסִבֶּינָה]		[סוֹבֵבְנָה]	
[17]יָסֵב, יַסֵּב	[18]יוּסַב, יֻסַּב	יְסוֹבֵב	[יְסוֹבַב
תָּסֵב	[תּוּסַב	תְּסוֹבֵב	תְּסוֹבַב
תָּסֵב	תּוּסַב	תְּסוֹבֵב	תְּסוֹבַב
[תָּסֵבִּי]	תּוּסַבִּי	[תְּסוֹבְבִי	תְּסוֹבֲבִי
אָסֵב	[אוּסַב]	אֲסוֹבֵב	אֲסוֹבַב
יָסֵבּוּ, יַסֵּבּוּ	יוּסַבּוּ	יְסוֹבְבוּ	יְסוֹבֲבוּ
תְּסִבֶּינָה	[תּוּסַבֶּינָה	[תְּסוֹבֵבְנָה]	תְּסוֹבַבְנָה
תָּסֵבּוּ	תּוּסַבּוּ	תְּסוֹבְבוּ	תְּסוֹבֲבוּ
תְּסִבֶּינָה	תּוּסַבֶּינָה	[תְּסוֹבֵבְנָה	תְּסוֹבַבְנָה
נָסֵב	נוּסַב]	נְסוֹבֵב]	נְסוֹבַב]
וַיָּסֶב			
(יְסִבְּכֶם) יְסִבֵּנִי		יְסוֹבְבֵנִי	
[19]מֵסֵב		מְסוֹבֵב	
מְסִבָּה			
מְסִבִּים			
מְסִבּוֹת			
מוּסָב			
מוּסַבָּה		מְסוֹבָב	

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

i. e]. The Ḳameṣ is preserved in most cases, in order to distinguish it from the Perfect. It occurs also in the פָּעֵל formation, like טוֹב in the ע"ו, e. g. גֹּל Ps 22:9, חֹם 1S 21:7, הֲרֹב דְּבָרִים Jb 11:2,[280] and before Maḳḳef תָּם־דֶּרֶךְ Pr. 13:16.

j. f]. Examples of these three formations are: נָחַר Jr 6:29, וְנָסַב ibid 31:39; נָמַס Ps 22:15, נָסַבָּה Ez 26:2; וְנָגֹלּוּ Is 34:4, וְנָקֹטּוּ Ez 6:9, נָגֹזּוּ Na 1:12.[280a] It occurs also with Ḥireḳ under the preformative and without Dagesh in the third radical in the inflexions, e. g. נִחָל Ez 25:3 (on Ḳameṣ without pause see above § 16c), וְנִחָלוּ ibid 7:24, נִחָלְתְּ ibid 22:16, נִחַת Mal 2:5, נִחַר Ps 69:4, נֵחַנְתְּ Jr 22:23 (with compensatory lengthening of the vowel under the preformative).[281]

k. g]. The Ḳibbuṣ under the ד, in place of Ḥolem in נְשַׁדֻּנוּ Mi 2:4 is unique. Ḥayyuj [N. 118] construes the termination נוּ as a pronominal suffix, 1st person plural, the sense being נָשַׁדּוּ מִמֶּנּוּ *they were plundered by us*, just as יְצָאֻנִי Jr 10:20 is for יָצְאוּ מִמֶּנִּי.[282]

l. h]. The Imperfect occurs also with Ḥolem in the second syllable: יִתֹּם Ez 47:12, וַתִּתֹּם Gn 47:18, תִּדֹּמִּי Jr 48:2, and with Ḳibbuṣ instead of Ḥolem, תִּתֻּם Ez 24:11. The initial radical, even when not a laryngeal, sometimes loses the Dagesh, and the preceding vowel receives compensatory lengthening, e. g. וַתֵּקַל Gn 16:4, יֵמַר Is 24:7, יֵחַת ibid 7:8, יֵקַלּוּ Is 2:30 (also יֵקַלּוּ Is 30:16 in a different sense), יֵחָרוּ Ez 24:10.[283] [But see above, d].

m. i]. Ibn Janaḥ [*Opusc.* 226] refers to the Nif'al of ע"ע the forms הֵרֹמּוּ Nu 17:10, אֵרוֹמָם Is 33:10, and וַיֵּרֹמּוּ Ez 10:15.[284] To this category may also belong תִּשּׁוֹמֵם Ec 7:16, with the doubling of the *Mem* because of the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

influence of the Po'el conjugation.[285] Ḥayyuj, however, regards this from as Hithpa'el, the second ת having assimilated to the שׁ [N. 118].

n. j]. The form נֵאָרִים Mal 3:9 is in place of נְאָרִים*, according to Ibn Janaḥ [loc. cit. 178 f.], with compensatory lengthening of the vowel under the א and with the Shewa under the Nun changed to Ṣere on account of its preceding a laryngeal. Ḥayyuj, however, construes it as Nif'al of נאר, on the analogy of נִגָּשִׁים [N. 105].[286]

o. k]. Before a laryngeal the Ḥaṭef Pathaḥ changes to Pathaḥ, e. g. הַחִלֹּותִי Dt 2:31, הַחִתֹּותָ Is 9:3. Similarly in the Infinitive and Imperative before suffixes, e. g. הַחִלָּם Gn 11:6. It occurs also with Ḥaṭef Segol under the preformative in הֱקִלֹּותַנִי 2S 19:44 [in our text הֲקִלֹּותַנִי]

p. l]. A Ṣere in place of Ḳameṣ in the initial syllable is found in הֵחֵל Ez 20:9, לְהֵדֵק 2Chr 34:7; also in the Imperfect תֵּחֵל Lv 21:9.[287] Some, however, regard these forms as Nif'al, with compensatory lengthening of the vowel under the preformative and with Ṣere instead of Pathaḥ under the ח in הֵחֵל and תֵּחֵל.

q. m]. Instances of both these forms occur in the same verb, e. g. אָחֵל Jos 3:7, יָחֵל Ju 10:18; also אַחֵל Ez 39:7 and יַחֵל Nu 30:3, the differentiation in form indicating difference in meaning. The Ṣere in the second syllable changes to Ḥireḳ before pronominal suffixes, e. g. וַיְשִׁמֵּם 1S 5:6, אֲחִתְּךָ Jr 1:7, יְנִדֻּהוּ Jb 18:18; and to long Ḥireḳ in יְחִיתַן Hab 2:17 (this is, however, referred by some [Ibn Janaḥ, *Opusc.* 79] to a stem חית).[288] A Ḥireḳ in the second syllable, even without pronominal suffixes, is found in וַנַּשִּׁים Nu 21:30, יַשִּׁים Jr 49:20.[289]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

r. n]. A Pathaḥ in place of Ṣere in the second syllable is found in מְסַב 1K 6:29 and מֵצַל Ez 31:3.

s. o]. With the prefix ב we find בְּהְשַׁמָּה Lv 26:43 for בְּהָשַּׁמָּה[a] (cf. ibid 26:34.35).[290] וְהָשַׁמּוּ Jb 21:5 is Imperative Hif'il, with Pathaḥ under the ש instead of Ṣere. In some Mss., however, the ש has a Dagesh, in which case the form is to be taken as Hof'al Perfect converted into Imperfect by the Waw consecutive.

t. p]. A Dagesh is found after the Shureḳ in תוּשַּׁד Is 33:1 and יוּשַּׁד Hos 10:14.

u. *Rem.* 1. The Pi'el and its reflexive, the Hithpa'el, are rarely employed in the ע"ע verbs. They are usually superseded by the Po'el and its reflexive, the Hithpo'el; e. g. יְרוֹשֵׁשׁ Jr 5:17, מִתְרוֹשֵׁשׁ Pr 13:7; מְקוֹשֵׁשׁ Nu 15:32, הִתְקוֹשְׁשׁוּ Ze 2:1, etc. Examples of the Pi'el and the Hithpa'el in the ע"ע verbs are: חָנְנֵנִי Ps 9:14 (Pi'el, according to Hayyuj [N. 109], although the characteristic Dagesh is missing, in proof of which he adduces the analogous example בְּהִתְחַנְנוֹ Gn 42:21);[b] לְחֶנְנָהּ Ps 102:14 (with Segol instead of Pathaḥ and without Dagesh in the Nun); הִתְעַלַּלְתִּי Ex 10:2; וָאֶתְחַנַּן Dt 3:23. The Pilpel and its reflexive, the Hithpalpel, also occur: וְגִלְגַּלְתִּיךָ Jr 51:25. יִשְׁתַּקְשְׁקוּן Na 2:5, הִתְגַּלְגָּלוּ Jb 30:14, etc. The form תִּתָּבָר 2S 22:27 is in place of תִּתְבָּרַר,[291] with the rejection of the final ר but with the retention of the normal vowels.

a. The Dagesh in the ש of בָּהְשַּׁמָּה Lv 26:34 is due to the analogy of the ע"ו, thus הֵנֵד=הָשֵּׁם. With the pronominal suffix the Dagesh in the ש remains.

b. It may also be taken as Ḳal, like שָׁמְרֵנִי Ps 16:1, were it not for the fact that the ח has Pathaḥ, although some MSS. have Ḳameṣ.[290a]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

v. *Rem*. 2. In the following instances the Dagesh in the third radical is dropped, and the vowel preceding it is reduced to Shewa:[292] וְנָבְלָה Gn 11:7[a]; וְנָבְקָה Is 19:3, וְנָסְבָה Ez 41:7; יִדְּמוּ Ex 15:16, וְיִדְּמוּ Jb 29:21, וַיִּתְּמוּ Dt 34:8; וְנִדְּמָה Jr 8:14; וְהֻמְּכוּ Jb 24:24[b] (for נָסַבָּה, נָבַקָּה, נָבַלָּה, Ez 26:2, יִדַּמּוּ, וַיִּדַּמּוּ, וַיִּתַּמּוּ, וְנִדַּמָּה, וְהוּמַכּוּ). The Dagesh is omitted in the third radical without affecting the preceding vowel in the following examples: וְנָבֹזָה 1S 14:36, בְּחֻקוֹ Pr 8:27 [in our text with Dagesh], בְּחוּקוֹ ibid 29, הַעֻזָּה ibid 7:13, הֵתַמּוּ 2S 20:18 [in our text הֵתַמּוּ], כַּהֲתִימְךָ Is 33:1 (but see above, c), וְיוּחֲקוּ Jb 19:23 [in our text וְיֻחָקוּ].

w. *Rem*. 3. In the anomalous form וַהֲפִתִּית Pr 24:28 the long Ḥireḳ is in place of Ḥolem, cf. הֲסִבּוֹת.[293] According to my brother Moses, however, it is Pi'el of פתה, the ה being interrogatory.

§ 39. Verbs ל״א, מצא

a. The ל״א and ל״ה verbs are intimately related, and they frequently interchange, or borrow forms from one another.[294] Thus we find the following ל״א verbs with inflections, characteristic of the ל״ה: יִכְלֶה Gn 23:6, כָּלוּ 1S 6:10, מָלוּ Ez 28:16, וְנָשׂוּ ibid 39:26, הִמְצִיתָךְ 2S 3:8, נָשׂוּא Ps 139:20, יִנָּשׂוּא Jr 10:5 (in the last two instances the

a. This form may also be explained either as Ḳal, on the analogy of וְנָבֹזָה 1S 14:36, or as Hif'il (for נָבֵל), the ending ־ָה in either case being ה Paragogicum as in נֵרְדָה in the same sentence. Some grammarians regard this form as Ḳal of פ״ן on the analogy of וְנָפְלָה Nu 5:27.

b. On the last four examples see my father's opinion above, d. The talmudic form נָמוֹךְ, which is adduced by some to prove the פ״ן stem of וְהֻמְּכוּ, may in itself be a Nif'al on the analogy of נָגוֹז and נָגֹל. [But we also find such forms as מְנֻמָּיכוֹ, Sifre Beha'alothkha § 83, etc.]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

א is either pleonastic, or the א and ו may have interchanged places), וְהִפְלָה Ex 9:4, וְהִפְלֵיתִי ibid 8:18, etc.[a] תְּרַפֶּינָה Jb 5:18, נִרְפָּתָה Jr 51:9. On the other hand, a number of ל״ה verbs are inflected like ל״א, e. g. וַיְחַפְּאוּ 2K 17:9, מְרַפֵּא Jr 38:4 (from רַפֵּה, *weaken*), רָצוֹא Ez 1:14 (from רצה=רוץ, of which we find וַתִּרֶץ Ps 50:18), וּקְרָאָהוּ Gn 42:38, יִקְרֶה Dn 10:14 (orthographically like ל״ה but read like ל״א) יִקְרָא Dt 22:6, תְּלוּאִים Hos 11:7, תְּלָאוּם 2S 21:12. The א and the ה also interchange frequently, e. g. לְהֵחָבֵה 1K 22:25 and 2K 7:12, וַיֶּחֱלֶא 2Chr 16:20, יְמַלֵּה Jb 8:21, רְפָה Ps 60:4, אֶרְפָּה Jr 3:22, וְהִפְלָא Dt 28:59, יִשְׁנֶא La 4:1, וְשִׁנָּא 2K 25:29, יְשֻׁנֶּא Ec 8:1, וְרָצְאתִי Ez 43:27.

b. a*]. The feminine ending ־ָת, in place of ־ָה, occurs in וְחָטָאת Ex 5:16, וְקָרָאת Dt 31:29. Cf. also נִפְלָאת Ps 118:27. (for נִפְלָאָה) [but see above, note 105].

c. b]. The ה of the afformative is elided in וּמְצֶאןָ Ru 1:9 and קְרֶאןָ ibid 20, with Segol under the second radical changed to Ṣere [but not in our text].[294a] In קְרֶאןָ Ex 2:20 both the vowel and the ה of the afformative are dropped, and the א is sounded with Segol.[295]

d. c]. The participle feminine is either מֹצְאָה, or, more commonly, מֹצֵאת 2S 18:22, נֹשֵׂאת Es 2:15, contraction of מֹצֵאֶת, נֹשֵׂאֶת or מֹצֵאַת, נֹשֵׂאַת; also, with Ṣere shifted forward under the third radical כִּמְצִאַת Cn 8:10 and נֹשְׂאַת 1K 10:22 [cf. above, note 205).[295a] The form נִשֵּׂאת 2S 19:43, however, is not Nif'al particple, but a noun analogous to מְלֵאת Cn 5:12.[296]

a. There may, however, be two cognate stems; namely פלא and פלה. [But in mishnic Hebrew the interchange of the verbs ל״א and ל״י is quite common].

* See tables, pp. 158–159.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

e. d]. Before a laryngeal, the Ḥireḳ of the afformative changes either to Segol or to Pathaḥ, e. g. נֶחְבָּא 2S 17:9 and נֶחְבֵּאתָ Gn 31:27. But וְנֶחְבָּה Jr 49:10 is an Infinitive on the analogy of נִקְרָא 2S 1:6, with final ה in place of א, and is not a perfect.[297]

f. e]. The Ḳameṣ in the second syllable is sometimes changed to Shewa in the plural, e. g. נֶחְבְּאִים Jos 10:17 and הַנִּמְצְאִים Es 1:5 [See above § 23h and note 121].

g. f]. As to הֶחְבְּאָתָה Jos 6:17 [in our text הֶחְבְּאַתָה, but cf. Ges.-K. § 75 oo and *Min. Shai* ad loc.], see above § 37t. The Pathaḥ under the א points to the more original form הֶחְבְּאַת, before the 2nd feminine characteristic ה was affixed.[298] Cf. also נִפְלְאַתָה 2S 1:26.

h. *Rem.* 1. Some ל״א verbs retain the א third radical orthographically, but are sometimes inflected on the analogy of the ל״ה verbs, (cf. above, a) e. g. כָּלֵאתִי Ps 119:101, מְלֹאת Lv 8:33, וּבִמְלוֹאת Es 1:5 (with both quiescent Waw and Alef), קְרֹאת Ju 8:1, חֲטֹאתוֹ Ez 33:1.2. בְּהִנָּבְאוֹתוֹ Zc 13:4 (cf. also the mishnic לְהִבָּרְאוֹת Ab. 5:1), וּמוֹצֶא Ec 7:26, חוֹטֶא ibid 2:25, 8:12, 9:18, וְהַחוֹטֶא Is 65:20, חוֹטְאִים 1S 14:33, קוֹרְאִים Ps 99:6, etc. [but see above, note 121].

i. *Rem.* 2. The א is frequently rejected in the inflexions of the ל״א verbs, e. g. הֶחֱטִי 2K 13:6 and Jr 32:35 [in our text the latter is vocalized הַחֲטִי], אֲחַטֶּנָּה Gn 31:39, וַיֵּרָפוּ 2K 2:22, וַיְרַפּוּ Jr 8:11, מָלֵתִי Jb 32:18. In מֵחֲטוֹ Gn 20:6 the א is changed to Waw.[299]

j. *Rem.* 3. The verb נשא suffers changes peculiar to both ל״א and פ״ן verbs. Thus, Imperative, שָׂא, שָׂאֵהוּ Nu 11:12 (also נְשָׂא and נְסָה Ps 4:7, in place of נְשָׂא);[300] Infinitive שׂוֹא Ps 89:10 and שְׂאֵת (for שְׂאֵת) Gn 49:3, also,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

V. WEAK

	Ḳal		Nif'al	Pi'el
Perf. Sing. 3m.	מָצָא	מָלֵא	נִמְצָא[d]	דִּכָּא, מִצֵּא
2f.	מָֽצְאָה[a]	מָֽלְאָה	נִמְצְאָה	מִצְּאָה
2m.	מָצָאתָ	מָלֵאתָ	נִמְצֵאתָ	מִצֵּאתָ
2f.	מָצָאת	מָלֵאת	נִמְצֵאת	מִצֵּאת
1c.	מָצָאתִי	מָלֵאתִי	נִמְצֵאתִי	מִצֵּאתִי
Plur. 3c.	מָֽצְאוּ	מָֽלְאוּ	נִמְצְאוּ	מִצְּאוּ
2m.	מְצָאתֶם	מְלֵאתֶם	נִמְצֵאתֶם	מִצֵּאתֶם
2f.	מְצָאתֶן	מְלֵאתֶן	נִמְצֵאתֶן	מִצֵּאתֶן
1c.	מָצָאנוּ	מָלֵאנוּ	נִמְצֵאנוּ	מִצֵּאנוּ
Inf.	מְצֹא		הִמָּצֵא	מַצֵּא
Inf. absol.	מָצוֹא		נִמְצֹא	מַצֹּא
Imp. Sing. m.	מְצָא		הִמָּצֵא	מַצֵּא
f.	מִצְאִי		[הִמָּֽצְאִי	מַצְּאִי
Plur. m.	מִצְאוּ		הִמָּֽצְאוּ	מַצְּאוּ
f.	מְצֶאנָה[b]		הִמָּצֶאנָה]	מַצֶּאנָה
Impf. Sing. 3m.	יִמְצָא		יִמָּצֵא	יְמַצֵּא
3f.	תִּמְצָא		תִּמָּצֵא	תְּמַצֵּא
2m.	תִּמְצָא		תִּמָּצֵא	תְּמַצֵּא
2f.	תִּמְצְאִי		תִּמָּצְאִי	תְּמַצְּאִי
1c.	אֶמְצָא		אֶמָּצֵא	אֲמַצֵּא
Plur. 3m.	יִמְצְאוּ		יִמָּֽצְאוּ	יְמַצְּאוּ
3f.	תִּמְצֶאנָה		תִּמָּצֶאנָה	תְּמַצֶּאנָה
2m.	תִּמְצְאוּ		תִּמָּֽצְאוּ	תְּמַצְּאוּ
2f.	תִּמְצֶאנָה		תִּמָּצֶאנָה	תְּמַצֶּאנָה
1c.	נִמְצָא		[נִמָּצֵא]	נְמַצֵּא
Shortened Impf. (Jussive)				
Impf. with Suff.	יִמְצָאֵנִי	יִמְצָֽאֲךָ,		יְמַצְּאֵנִי
Part. act. S. m.	מוֹצֵא		נִמְצָא[d]	מְמַצֵּא
f.	מוֹצֵאת[c]		נִמְצֵאת[c]	מְמַצֵּאת
Pl. m.	מֽוֹצְאִים		נִמְצָאִים[e]	מְמַצְּאִים
f.	מֽוֹצְאוֹת		נִמְצָאוֹת	מְמַצְּאוֹת
pass.	מָצוּא			מְמֻצָּא

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

VERBS ל״א

Pu‘al	Hif‘il	Hof‘al	Hithpa‘ēl
קֹרָא [מֻצָּא	הִמְצִיא	[הֻמְצָא	[הִתְמַצֵּא
מֻצְּאָה	[1] הִמְצִיאָה	הֻמְצְאָה	הִתְמַצְּאָה
[297a] מֻצֵּאתָ	הִמְצֵאתָ	[297a] הֻמְצֵאתָ	הִתְמַצֵּאתָ
מֻצֵּאת	הִמְצֵאת	הֻמְצָאת	הִתְמַצֵּאת
מֻצֵּאתִי	הִמְצֵאתִי	הֻמְצֵאתִי	הִתְמַצֵּאתִי
מֻצְּאוּ	הִמְצִיאוּ	הֻמְצְאוּ	הִתְמַצְּאוּ
מֻצֵּאתֶם	הִמְצֵאתֶם	הֻמְצֵאתֶם	הִתְמַצֵּאתֶם
מֻצֵּאתֶן	הִמְצֵאתֶן	הֻמְצֵאתֶן	הִתְמַצֵּאתֶן
[מֻצֵּאנוּ	הִמְצֵאנוּ	[הֻמְצֵאנוּ	[הִתְמַצֵּאנוּ
wanting	הַמְצִיא הַמְצֵא	wanting	הִתְמַצֵּא wanting
wanting	הַמְצֵא הַמְצִיאִי הַמְצִיאוּ הַמְצֶאנָה	wanting	[הִתְמַצֵּא הִתְמַצְּאִי הִתְמַצְּאוּ [הִתְמַצֶּאנָה
[יְמֻצָּא	יַמְצִיא	[יֻמְצָא	[יִתְמַצֵּא
תְּמֻצָּא	תַּמְצִיא	תֻּמְצָא	תִּתְמַצֵּא
תְּמֻצָּא	תַּמְצִיא	תֻּמְצָא	תִּתְמַצֵּא
תְּמֻצְּאִי	תַּמְצִיאִי	תֻּמְצְאִי	תִּתְמַצְּאִי
אֲמֻצָּא	אַמְצִיא	אֻמְצָא	אֶתְמַצֵּא
יְמֻצְּאוּ	יַמְצִיאוּ	יֻמְצְאוּ	יִתְמַצְּאוּ
תְּמֻצֶּאנָה	תַּמְצֶאנָה	תֻּמְצֶאנָה	תִּתְמַצֶּאנָה
תְּמֻצְּאוּ	תַּמְצִיאוּ	תֻּמְצְאוּ	תִּתְמַצְּאוּ
תְּמֻצֶּאנָה	תַּמְצֶאנָה	תֻּמְצֶאנָה	תִּתְמַצֶּאנָה
[נְמֻצָּא	נַמְצִיא	[נֻמְצָא	[נִתְמַצֵּא
	יַמְצֵא		
	יַמְצִיאֵנִי		
[מֻצָּא	מַמְצִיא	[הֻמְצָא]	[מִתְמַצֵּא
מֻצֵּאת	מַמְצֵאת		מִתְמַצֵּאת
			מִתְמַצְּאִים
			[מִתְמַצְּאוֹת
	מֻמְצָא		

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

with א elided and Ṣere retracted מִשֵּׁתוֹ Jb 41:17; Imperfect תִּשֶּׂאנָה Ru 1:9[a], also תִּשֶּׂאֶינָה Ez 23:49, with Segol under the א followed by Yod or Prolongation [but in our text the reading is תִּשֶּׂאינָה, with Segol under the שׂ, cf. *Min. Shai* ad l.].

k: Rem. 4. In the pi'el a number of verbs occur on the analogy of the ל״ה, e. g. נִשָּׂא 2S 19:43, 1K 9:11, דִּכָּא Ps 143:3, מִלָּא Jr 51:34. Jacob b. El'azar reads the latter with Ṣere under the ל, but we found it with Ḳameṣ in all the authentic Mss.

§ 40. Verbs ל״ה, בנה

a. The chief characteristic of the ל״ה verbs is that, in the inflected forms, the third radical changes frequently to Yod, the אהו״י letters being interchangeable.[301] This Yod, however, is mostly quiescent, e. g. בָּנִיתָ, etc.; which are contractions of בָּנַיְתָ, etc., on the analogy of שָׁמַרְתָּ, etc. The Yod is dropped entirely in וְהָיִתָ 2S 15:33, וְהָיִתָה ibid 10:11, בָּנִתִי 1K 8:44; but reappears as distinct in numerous instances: חָסָיוּ Dt 32:37, יֶאֱתָיוּ Ps 68:32, נָטָיוּ ibid 73:2, חָסָיָה ibid 57:2, יֶחֱסָיוּן ibid 36:8, יִשְׁתָּיוּן ibid 78:44, יֶחֱזָיוּן Is 26:11, etc., and in the passive participles of the Ḳal (בְּנוּיָה, בָּנוּי, etc.).

b. a*]. The ת is in place of the third radical ה, which could hardly remain distinct before the feminine afformative ה ָ־. In וְעָשָׂת Lv 25:21, הֶלְאָת Ez 24:12, הָגְלָת Jr 13:19, the ת either represents the third radical ה, or, which is

a. Also with the omission of א, וַתִּשַּׁקְנָה Ru 1:14.

* See tables, pp. 162–163.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

more likely, it is the feminine-characteristic, the final radical having dropped.[302]

c. b]. The tone is on the penultima in the following cases: תֶּ֫עוּ Is 16:8, כָּ֫לוּ Ps 37:20, חָ֫זוּ Jb 24:1 [in our text חָזוּ].

d. c]. The ה is retained in עֲשֹׂה Pr 21:3, קְנֹה ibid 16:16, רְאֹה Gn 48:11, הֱיֵה Ez 21:15, וּרְאֵה Ps 142:5.[303] It also occurs with suffixed Nun, מֵחֲרוֹן Ps 85:4 [cf. supra § 17b] and with suffixed ה, לְרַאֲוָה Ez 28:17, on the analogy of לְאַהֲבָה Dt 11:13.22, in which case the ה radical is changed to distinct Waw.

e. *Rem.* The Infinitive and the noun, being kindred in meaning, sometimes share the characteristics of each other. Thus, the Infinitive occurs with plural endings in בִּבְנוֹתַיִךְ Ez 16:31 and בְּהִזָּרוֹתֵיכֶם ibid 6:8, while nouns sometime occur in the sense of the Infinitive, e. g. וּלְמַסַּע Nu 10:2 וּמִסְפָּר ibid. 23:10, לְמַסַּע Dt 10:11, לְמַשְׂאוֹת Ez 17:9, וּמִשְׁלוֹחַ Es 9:19.22.[304]

f. d]. The ה radical is sometimes changed to Waw, e. g. בָּכוֹ Is 30:19, Jr 22:10 and 50:4, Mi 1:10, הָרוֹ Is 59:4, מָרוֹ La 1:20, עָשׂוֹ Jr 4:18, רָאוֹ Gn 26:28 and Is 6:9;[305] also with suffixed ת, אָלוֹת Hos 10:4, רָאוֹת Is 42:20, the ת, according to some [Ḥayyuj, N. 62 and 68], being in place of ה radical and the Waw, Waw of Prolongation.

g. e]. When the first radical is a laryngeal it takes either Ḥaṭef Pathaḥ, עֲלֵה Ex 24:12, הֲיִי Gn 24:60, or Ḥaṭef Segol, עֱנוּ Ps 147:7, אֱלִי Joel 1:8, הֱוֵא Jb 37:6. A Ṣere occurs also under the א in אֵפוּ Ex 16:23 and אֵתָיוּ Is 21:12.[306] and under the ה in הֵתָיוּ Jr 12:9 (for אֲתָיוּ).[306a] The form וֶחְיֵה Pr 7:2, is unique.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

P. WEAK VERB

	Kal	Niph'al	Pi'ēl
Perf. Sing. 3m.	גָּלָה[1a]	נִגְלָה	גִּלָּה
3f.	גָּלְתָה[1a]	נִגְלְתָה	גִּלְּתָה
2m.	גָּלִיתָ	נִגְלֵיתָ, ־ִיתָ	גִּלִּיתָ
2f.	גָּלִית	נִגְלֵית	גִּלִּית
1c.	גָּלִיתִי	נִגְלֵיתִי	גִּלִּיתִי, גִּלֵּיתִי
Plur. 3c.	גָּלוּ[1b]	נִגְלוּ	גִּלּוּ
2m.	גְּלִיתֶם	[נִגְלֵיתֶם	גִּלִּיתֶם
2f.	גְּלִיתֶן	נִגְלֵיתֶן]	[גִּלִּיתֶן]
1c.	גָּלִינוּ	נִגְלֵינוּ	גִּלִּינוּ
Inf.	גְּלוֹת[1c]	הֵרָאֹה, הִגָּלוֹת (Ju 13:21)	גַּלּוֹת[1m]
Inf. absol.	גָּלֹה[1d]	נִגְלֹה, הִנָּקֵה (Is 2:27)	גַּלֹּה, גַּלֵּה
Imp. Sing. m.	גְּלֵה[1e]	הִגָּלֵה	גַּלֵּה, גַּל[1o]
f.	גְּלִי	הִגָּלִי	גַּלִּי
Plur. m.	גְּלוּ	הִגָּלוּ	גַּלּוּ[1o]
f.	גְּלֶינָה	[הִגָּלֶינָה]	[גַּלֶּינָה]
Impf. Sing. 3m.	יִגְלֶה[1f]	יִגָּלֶה[1g]	יְגַלֶּה
3f.	תִּגְלֶה	תִּגָּלֶה	תְּגַלֶּה
2m.	תִּגְלֶה	תִּגָּלֶה	תְּגַלֶּה
2f.	תִּגְלִי	[תִּגָּלִי]	תְּגַלִּי
1c.	אֶגְלֶה	אֶגָּלֶה, אִגָּ'	אֲגַלֶּה[1p]
Plur. 3m.	יִגְלוּ	יִגָּלוּ[1h]	יְגַלּוּ
3f.	תִּגְלֶינָה[1j]	תִּגָּלֶינָה[1k]	תְּגַלֶּינָה
2m.	תִּגְלוּ	תִּגָּלוּ	תְּגַלּוּ
2f.	תִּגְלֶינָה	תִּגָּלֶינָה	תְּגַלֶּינָה
1c.	נִגְלֶה	[נִגָּלֶה]	נְגַלֶּה
Shortened Impf.	יִגֶל	יִגָּל	וַיְתָו יְגַל (IS 21:14)
Impf. with Suff.	יִגְלְךָ, יִגְלֵנִי		יְגַלְּךָ, יְגַלֵּנִי[1l]
Part. act.	גֹּלֶה[1m]	נִגְלֶה[1n]	מְגַלֶּה
pass.	גָּלוּי		מְגֻלֶּה

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

VERBS ל״ה

Pu'al	Hif'il	Hof'al	Hithpa'ēl
גֻּלָּה	הֶגְלָה, הִגְלָה	הָגְלָה	הִתְגַּלָּה
גֻּלְּתָה	הִגְלְתָה	הָגְלְתָה	הִתְגַּלְּתָה
גֻּלֵּיתָ	הִגְלֵיתָ, ־ִיתָ	הָגְלֵיתָ	הִתְגַּלֵּיתָ
גֻּלֵּית	הִגְלֵית, ־ִית	(הָגְלֵית)	הִתְגַּלֵּית
גֻּלֵּיתִי	הִגְלֵיתִי, ־ִיתִי	הָגְלֵיתִי	הִתְגַּלֵּיתִי
גֻּלּוּ	הִגְלוּ	הָגְלוּ	הִתְגַּלּוּ
גֻּלֵּיתֶם	הִגְלֵיתֶם, ־ִיתֶם	(הָגְלֵיתֶם	הִתְגַּלֵּיתֶם
גֻּלֵּיתֶן	הִגְלֵיתֶן	הָגְלֵיתֶן	הִתְגַּלֵּיתֶן
גֻּלֵּינוּ	הִגְלֵינוּ	הָגְלֵינוּ)	הִתְגַּלֵּינוּ
גֻּלּוֹת	הַגְלוֹת		הִתְגַּלּוֹת
	הַגְלֵה	הָגְלֵה	
wanting	הֶרֶב, הַגְלֵה	wanting	(הִתְגַּלֵּה) הִתְגַּל
	הַגְלִי		הִתְגַּלִּי
	הַגְלוּ		הִתְגַּלּוּ
	הַגְלֶינָה		(הִתְגַּלֶּינָה)
יְגֻלֶּה	יַגְלֶה	(יָגְלֶה	יִתְגַּלֶּה
תְּגֻלֶּה	תַּגְלֶה	תָּגְלֶה	(תִּתְגַּלֶּה)
תְּגֻלֶּה	תַּגְלֶה	תָּגְלֶה	תִּתְגַּלֶּה
(תְּגֻלִּי	תַּגְלִי	תָּגְלִי	תִּתְגַּלִּי
אֲגֻלֶּה)	אַגְלֶה	אָגְלֶה	אֶתְגַּלֶּה
יְגֻלּוּ	יַגְלוּ	יָגְלוּ	יִתְגַּלּוּ
(תְּגֻלֶּינָה	תַּגְלֶינָה	תָּגְלֶינָה	(תִּתְגַּלֶּינָה)
תְּגֻלּוּ	תַּגְלוּ	תָּגְלוּ	תִּתְגַּלּוּ
תְּגֻלֶּינָה	תַּגְלֶינָה	תָּגְלֶינָה	(תִּתְגַּלֶּינָה)
נְגֻלֶּה)	נַגְלֶה	נָגְלֶה)	נִתְגַּלֶּה
	וַיֶּגֶל		יִתְגַּל
	יַגְלְךָ, יַגְלֵנִי		
גִּלָּה	מַגְלֶה		מִתְגַּלֶּה
	מָגְלֶה		

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

h. f]. The Imperfect sometimes occurs in shortened form, without the ending ה ֶ, in which case the final vowel, the Segol, recedes to the first radical,[306b] e. g. וַיִּ֫קֶן Gn 33:19, וָאֵרֶד and וָאֵפֶן Dt 9:15, אַל תֵּפֶן Nu 16:15. When the first or second radical is a laryngeal, the Segol changes to Pathaḥ, and the Ḥireḳ of the preformative frequently changes to Ṣere, or, in verbs primae laryngealis הח״ע, to Pathaḥ, e. g. וַתֵּתַע Gn 21:14, וַתֵּכַהּ Jb 17:7, וְתֶחַז Mi 4:11, יָחַד . . . יַחַד Pr 27:17 (with pausal Ḳameṣ under the Yod of the first instance, like אָחַז Jb 23:9 and וַיָּחַל 2K 1:2),[307] יַעַן, יַעַשׂ, וַתַּהַר Gn 4:1.

i. *Rem.* 1. In the unabridged forms, the preformatives of the primae laryngealis take either Pathaḥ (always before ע) or Segol (always in the first person singular[a]), e. g. תַּחֲנֶה Ps 27:3, יַעֲשֶׂה, תַּעֲלֶה, תֶּחֱזֶה Ex 18:21, אֶעֱשֶׂה, אֶעֱלֶה. In היה and חיה, however, the Ḥireḳ of the preformative is retained, e. g. יִחְיֶה, יִהְיֶה etc.

j. *Rem.* 2. Further shortening of the Imperfect occurs when both the final radical and the vowel preceding it are rejected, e. g. וַיִּשְׁבְּ Jr 41:10, וַיִּפְתְּ Jb 31:27, וְיֵרְדְּ Nu 24:19, יֵשְׂטְ Pr 7:25, also וַיֵּאתְ Is 41:25 [in our text וַיֵּאת]. This shortening is due, according to Ibn Janaḥ, to the close connection of these words to the following words, as in the case of יֹשַׁבְתְּ and מְקֻנַּנְתְּ Jr 22:23, וְיֹלַדְתְּ Ju 13:5 [but see supra § 26 and note b]. This, however, does not seem probable, since these forms occur also in pause, e. g. וַיֵּשְׁתְּ Gn 27:25 and וַיֵּבְךְּ ibid 38. The form וַיִּחַדְּ Ex 1[illegible] is analogous, according to Ibn Janaḥ [*Riḳ* 106] to [illegible]u 21:1, with Pathaḥ under the ח on account of its being a

a. But cf. אֶעֱלֶה Jr 46:8, אֶעֱנֶה Jb 32:17. Some grammarians regard these as Hif'il.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

laryngeal. Hence the Dagesh and the Shewa of the ד. [cf. above § 4g and note 33].

k. *Rem*. 3. The final vowel in the Imperfect is sometimes Ṣere instead of Segol,[307a] e. g. יַעֲשֵׂה Is 64:3 [in our text יַעֲשֶׂה] תַּעֲשֵׂה Gn 26:29, Jos 7:9, 2S 13:12, Jr 40:16, נַעֲשֵׂה Jos 9:24, תְּהִיֵה Jr 17:17, תֵּרָאֵה Dn 1:13; also Ḳameṣ, וְאֶשְׁעָה Ps 119:117, תִּכְלָה 1K 17:14, and Hithpa'el וְנִשְׁתָּעָה Is 41:23 [See above § 36d].[307b]

l. *Rem*. 4. The final ה is changed to Yod in the following instances: תֶּמְחִי Jr 18:23 in place of תֶּמְחֶה,[a] וַתִּזְנִי ibid 3:6 in place of וַתִּזְנֶה;[b] רֹעִי Is 38:12 in place of רֹעֶה, וּכְחַכֵּי Hos 6:9 in place of וּכְחַכֵּה.[310]

m. g]. The Dagesh in the Nun of תִּרְאֶינָּה Mi 7:10 is unusual, for the Nun of this ending נה takes Dagesh only when used as a pronominal afformative, e. g. יְגִיעֶנָּה Is 26:5, etc. [see above § 33 f].

n. h]. In the construct state the Segol changes to Ṣere, e. g. קֹנֵה שָׁמַיִם Gn 14:19.22, etc. (but also קוֹנֶה לֵּב Pr 15:32), עֹשֵׂה פֶלֶא Ex 15:11, בּוֹנֵה יְרוּשָׁלַיִם Ps 147:2. The ה is sometimes replaced by א, נֹשֵׁא 1S 22:2, or by Yod, רֹעִי Is 38:12 and Zc 11:17, or by ת, פֹּרָת Gn 49:22 [but see above, note 105]. The feminine occurs with distinct Yod as third radical, e. g. עֹטְיָה Cn 1:7, הוֹמִיָּה Is 22:2,

a. This form is regarded as Ḳal by Ḥayyuj and most grammarians, the Segol of the preformative being in place of Ḥireḳ, as in אל תֶּמַח Ne 13:14.[308] Jacob ben El'azar [cf. above, note 83] however, regards them both, quite correctly, as Hif'il.

b. The ending ִי may also be construed as a feminine afformative in the second person, although the verb in the first part of the sentence is in the third person.[309] There are numerous examples of this construction in the Bible, e. g. כִּי יֵבֹשׁוּ ... אֲשֶׁר חֲמַדְתֶּם Is 1:29, גַּם אַתֶּם חַלְלֵי חַרְבִּי הֵמָּה Ze 2:12, כֻּלָּם ... וּבֹאוּ Jb 17:10, שִׁמְעוּ עַמִּים כֻּלָּם 1K 22:28, לְכֻלָּם ... וּלְסַרְנֵיכֶם 1S 6:4, etc. Cf. below § 82a.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

פֻּורִיָּה Ez 19:10, בְּכִיָּה La 1:16, צֹפִיָּה Pr 31:27, דֻמִיָּה Ps 65:2 (with Shureḳ [Ḳibbuṣ] in the first radical instead of Ḥolem),[311] הָאֹתִיּוֹת Is 45:11. The Ḥireḳ under the second radical in these examples (except the first) is probably on the analogy of תּוֹמִיךְ Ps 16:5 and יוֹסִיף Is 29:14 [so Ibn Janaḥ, *Opusc.* 328], or according to some, this is the regular feminine ִיָּה termination of relationship, found in such forms as תַּחְתִּיָּה Ps 86:13, שְׁלִשִׁיָּה Is 15:5, etc.

Nif'al

o. In the Nif'al of primae laryngealis, the preformative Nun takes either Pathah, נַעֲנֵיתִי Ez 14:4, or Segol, וְנֶחֱלֵיתִי Dn 8:27. The Ḥireḳ is, however, retained in several cases, נִהְיֵיתָ Dt 27:9, נִחֲרוּ Cn 1:6. In the Imperfect the preformatives take Ṣere וַיֵּעָלוּ Nu 16:27. The form וַתֵּעָלוּ Ez 36:3 is unique.[312]

p. i]. It also occurs with Ṣere as the final vowel, e. g. תִּבָּנֵה Nu 21:27, יִמָּצֵה Lv 5:9, and, according to Jacob ben El'azar [cf. above, note 83], quoting from the הִלְּלִי MS. of Toledo, תֵּאָפֵה Lv 6:10. The latter, however, is not corroborated by authentic Mss.

q. j]. We also find יִדַּחוּ Jr 23:12, with the tone on the penultima, in place of יִדָּחוּ.[313] Similarly, יִמַּח Ps 109:13 in place of יִמָּח, but וְיִגַּל Am 5:24 is to be referred to ע״ע verbs.[314]

r. k]. The form תֵּעָגֵנָה Ru 1:13 is to be regarded, in my opinion, as Nif'al of ענן.[315]

s. l]. The feminine is נִגְלָה, also נִגְלֵית on the analogy of נִפְקֶדֶת in the strong verbs and נִשֵּׂאת 1Chr 14:2 in the ל״א verbs.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Pi'el

t. m]. The form חַלּוֹתִי Ps 77:11 is to be referred either to the ל״ה or to the ע״ע verbs, on the analogy of חַנּוֹת Ps 77:10.[316] In לְכַלֵּא Dn 9:24 and וּכְחַכֵּי Hos 6:9 the ה radical is changed to א and Yod respectively.

u. n]. The final vowel is Segol, instead of Ṣere, in רַבֶּה Ju 9:29.

v. o]. The tone is on the penultima in the pausal forms הַסּוּ Ne 8:11,[317] עָרוּ עָרוּ Ps 137:7. In the first עָרוּ the tone recedes in order to avoid concurrence of two tone-syllables. In דַּלְיוּ Pr 26:7, the Dagesh of the ל is omitted for euphonic reasons.[318]

w. p]. The Ḥatef Pathaḥ under the preformative is sometimes changed to Ḥaṭef Segol, e. g. אֱזָרֶה Lv 26:33, Ez 5:12 and ibid 12:14 [cf. Ḥayyuj, N 75, also above, note 184].

x. q]. In אֲכֶלְךָ Ex 33:3, Segol occurs in place of Pathaḥ, with Dagesh in ל omitted as in אֲחַוְּךָ Jb 15:17.[319] In אֲרַיָּוֶךְ Is 16:9, the Yod is in place of the Waw middle radical, while the Waw replaces the final radical. The Ḳameṣ under the Yod instead of Shewa is for euphony.[320]

Hif'il and Hof'al

y. The vowel of the preformative in the Perfect is either Ḥireḳ or Segol, הִגְלָה Jr 22:12 [in our text הִגְלוּ] and הֶגְלָה Es 2:1; before a first laryngeal, the preformative ה takes Segol and, occasionally, also Pathaḥ, e. g. הֶעֱלָה Nu 8:3, וְהַעַלְתָה 1S 2:19, וְהַעֲלֵיתִי Ez 37:6.12, וְהַרְאֵיתִי Na 3:5. The forms הָעֲלָה Hab 1:15, like הָעֲבַרְתָּ Jos 7:7, is peculiar [see above § 25a and note 147].

z. r]. In הֶלְאָת Ez 24:12 and וְהִרְצָת Lv 26:34 the third radical is dropped, and the fem. termination ־ָה is replaced by its kindred characteristic ־ָת [cf. above, note 105].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

a' s]. The infinitive occurs also with Ḥireḳ under the ה, הִקְצוֹת Lv 14:43 and with Pathaḥ under the middle radical, מַהֲרְבַּת 2S 14:11.[321]

b' t]. This form is shortened further by rejecting the final vowel, in which case the first Segol is changed [back] to Pathaḥ, e. g. וַיַּשְׁקְ Gn 29:10, יַפְתְּ ibid 9:27, וַיַּרְא ibid 34:2, וַיַּךְ 2K 15:14, יַרְדְּ Is 41:2.

c' u]. The Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf under the preformative is sometimes lengthened before a ע to Ḥolem, as in זֹעֲמָה Nu 23:7 which is an Imperative like זָכְרָה Ne 5:19, e.g. הֹעֲלָה Ju 6:28, הֹעֲלָתָה Na 2:8 (cf. also מוֹרְאָה Ze 3:1). On הָגְלָת Jr 13:14 cf. above, z.

Hithpa'el

d' v]. In pause, the Pathaḥ is lengthened to Ḳameṣ, e. g. וַיִּתְחָל 2S 13:6; also without pause, particularly before a laryngeal or ר which cannot take Dagesh in the unapocapated forms, e. g. תִּתְגָּר, וְהִתְגָּר Dt 2:9.19, תִּשְׁתָּע Is 41:10 (apocopated from תִּשְׁתָּעֶה, וְהִתְגָּרֶה, תִּתְגָּרֶה), וְיִתְאָו Ps 45:12, תִּתְאָו Pr 23:3.6. תִּתְחַר Ps 37:1 is not Hithpa'el but Ḳal like תִּבְחַר, from the stem חרר, which also occurs as quadriliteral in Pi'el: מְתַחֲרֶה Jr 22:15 and תְּתַחֲרֶה ibid 12:5 [cf. below § 42d]. The form תִּתְחַר may also be regarded as apocopated Ḳal of the Quadriliteral תחרה, the regular form being תְּתַחֲרֶה.[322] [On נִשְׁתָּוָה Pr 27:15 see above § 231 and note 125].

e' *Rem.* 1. In the shortened Imperfect of היה and חיה, the Yod quiesces in long ī, e. g. יְהִי, יְחִי (in place of יְהִיְ, יְחִיְ) and the pausal forms יֶהִי, יֶחִי (in place of יֶהְיְ, יֶחְיְ). This Yod also changes sometimes to Waw, e. g. הֹוֶה Ne 6:6, הֹוָה Ez 7:26, הֱוִי Is 16:4, and, with further change of ה to א,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

הֱוֵא Jb 37:6. In יְהוּא Ec 11:3, the middle radical is missing, the Waw being a plur. afformative and the א pleonastic as in אָבוּא Is 28:12. According to Ḥayyuj [N. 74] this is a singular apocopated form for יֱהֱוֵא [= יִהְיֶה], like יְהִי for יִהְיֶה.[323]

f' *Rem.* 2. The forms חַי Gn 5:5, חָי ibid 43:27, וָחָיָה Ex 1:16, etc. are referred by Ḥayyuj [N. 77] to חיה, the final radical having dropped because of frequent use, and the Dagesh in חַיִּים Dt 4:4, etc. compensating for the missing Yod (instead of ה) radical. Thus חַי, according to him, is in place of חָיָה (adjecive), of which the plural feminine is חָיוֹת Ex 1:19, on the analogy of בָּלָה, בָּלוֹת Jos 9:4.5. It is, however, possible to regard all these instances quoted as verbs of the stem חיי.[324] of which וָחָיָה Ex 1:16 and חָיוֹת ibid 19 have compensatory lengthening of the vowel under the ח, instead of Dagesh in the Yod, in order not to confuse them with חַיָּה, חַיּוֹת (beasts). וָחַי Lv 25:36, is either a פַּעַל formation of חיי; or a contracted form of וְחַיֵּה [Pi'el Imperative], or of חַיֵּי [plural construct]. [These three possibilities are suggested in the Adnot. to Ḥayyuj, op. cit.]. According to Ḥayyuj [ibid] חֵי פרעה Gn 42:15 is the sing. [construct] of חַיִּים.[324a] The correct etymology of this from is, however, that it is a plural construct of חַיִּים, in which the Yod *radicalis* is dropped and the Yod plural retained.[324b]

g' *Rem.* 3. A number of ל״ה verbs belong also to the primae radicalis Nun, or Yod, and consequently share also the characteristics of these verbs, respectively. Thus, of ל״ה-פ״ן Imperf. Ḳal: יִזֶּה Lv 6:20, וַיִּז 2K 9:33, וְיֵז Is 63:3; יַטֶּה, וַיֵּט, תֶּשִׁי Dt 32:18, (on the analogy of תֶּמְחִי Jr 18:23) [but see above, 1];[a] Nif'al נִטָּיוּ Nu 24:6; Hif'il וַיַּז Lv 8:11,

a. This form is construed as Ḳal by most grammarians, for the Hif'il of this stem is causative in meaning (הִשָּׁה Jb 39:17).[325] נַשַּׁנִי

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ולא אָט Jb 23:11 (with Kameṣ in place of Pathaḥ to distinguish it from וַיְהַלֵּךְ אַט 1K 21:27), וַיַּךְ 2K 15:14, הִצּוּ Nu 26:9;[a] Hof'al הוּכָּה Ps 102:5. Of the ל"ה-פ"י verbs the following types occur: Ḳal Perfect וְיָעָה Is 28:17, יָרִיתִי Gn 31:51, יָפִית Cn 7:7, יָפוּ ibid 7:2, Infinitive לִירוֹת Ps 11:2, Imperative יְדוּ Jr 50:14, Imperfect וַיִּיף Ez 31:7,[b] וַתִּיפִי ibid 16:13, נִינָם Ps 74:8 (with Ḳameṣ under the נ instead of Ṣere, like וַנִּירָם Nu 21:30),[328] participle הַיּוֹנָה Ze 3:1 and Jr. 46:16; Nif'al Participle נוּגוֹת La 1:4, נוּגֵי Ze 3:18 (with Shureḳ in place of Ḥolem);[329] on יִיָּרֶה Ex 19:13, cf. supra § 36 f.; Pi'el: לְיַדּוֹת Zc 2:4, יַדּוּ, in place of יִיַדּוּ, Ob 11, like וַיַּגֶּה, in place of וַיְיַגֶּה, La 3:33;[c] Hif'il Perfect הוֹגָה La 1:12; Infinitive וּלְהוֹרוֹת Lv 10:11, also הֹרוֹ וְהֹגוֹ Is 59:13,[d] and הֻיְּדוֹת Ne 12:8, with Shureḳ [Ḳibbuṣ] under the ה in place of Ḥolem and with euphonic Dagesh in the Yod;[332] Imperfect וַיֹּרוּ 2Chr 35:23, וַיּוֹר 2K 13:17, יְהוֹדֶה Ne 11:17, תּוֹגְיוּן Jb 19:2; Hof'al הוּגָה 2S 20:13.

h' *Rem.* 4. Further anomalous forms of the ל"ה verbs are the following:

(a) הִמְסִיו Jos 14:8. This is according to Ḥayyuj [N. 85] an Aramaic form, like אִשְׁתִּיו Dn 5:3 f., וּרְמִיו ibid 3:21,

Gn 41:51, may be either Pi'el of this verb, with Pathaḥ under the Nun instead of Ḥireḳ, or Ḳal of נשׁה, on the analogy of חַנַּנִי ibid 33:11.[326]

a. To the same stem belong נָצֹא תֵּצֵא Jr 48:9,[327] with Ṣere under the preformative to compensate for the Dagesh omitted in the middle radical and with א in place of ה, as in וְנָשָׁא 2Chr 6:22, Is 24:2, and נֹשֶׁא 1S 22:2.

b. This is in place of וַיְיִף, which is the reading of Ben Asher, according to an authentic Ms., on the analogy of וַיִּשְׁבְּ Jr 41:10. Ibn Janaḥ [*Riḳ*. 28], however, maintains that this is the reading of Ben Naftali, while that of Ben Asher is וַיְיִף.

c. The last two instances are regarded by my father [*Ziḳ*. 64] as Hif'il in place of יְיַדּוּ and וַיְיַגֶּה.[330]

d. הֹרוֹ is to be referred to ירה, according to my father [*Galui* 6 and *Ziḳ*. 13], but הֹגוֹ is Infinitive Ḳal of הגה.[331]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

הַיְתָיו ibid 5:3.[333] My brother Moses, however, regards it as singular, corresponding to הִפְקִיד, in which the Waw is in place of the third radical He. [This view is quoted in the Adnot. to Ḥayyuj (ibid.)].

(b) כַּנְּלוֹתְךָ Is 33:1, in place of כְּהַנְלוֹתְךָ, of which the characteristic ה is dropped, leaving its vowel to the prefixed כ, with compensatory sharpening of the Nun.[334]

(c) וַיַּרְא Gn 39:3 (Ḳal of ראה), in place of וַיִּרְא, in order to distinguish it, according to Ḥayyuj [N. 93], from וַיִּר (Ḳal of ירה).[335] In all other persons, except the third person singular, it does not occur in this doubly apocopated form. My father, however, maintains that analogous forms may be constructed also in the other persons; namely, וַתֵּרְא, וָאֵרְא, etc.

(d) לַהְשׁוֹת 2K 19:25 for לְהַשְׁאוֹת (as in Is 37:26), in which the middle radical א is elided, leaving its vowel to the שׁ, while the Pathaḥ under the preformative ה recedes under the ל.[336]

(e) וְיֶשְׁחֲךָ Mi 6:14 (Hif'il of שחה), with Segol under the Yod instead of Pathaḥ, cf. יַשְׁחֶנָּה Pr 12:25.[337] In Hithpa'el the ה radical of this verb is doubled, הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה (with first radical changed to ו),[338] הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה, etc. In the Imperfect יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה and, with the rejection of the final ה, וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ Gn 24:26. The form מִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתֶם Ez 8:16 is a combination of מִשְׁתַּחֲוִים and הִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתֶם.[a] [339]

(f) שׁוֹשֵׁיתִי Is 10:13 is a Po'el form of שׁשה and should be inflected in the rest of the persons and tenses accordingly.[340]

(g) תְּתָאוּ Nu 34:7.8; this is either Pi'el of תאה or of תוה (cf. וְהִתְוִיתָ תָּו Ez 9:4), with Waw changed to Aleph.[341] On הִזַּכּוּ Is 1:16, see above § 27c.

a. My father, in his book *Ḥibbur ha-Leḳet*, regards the second ח as representing the added ה of הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

§ 41. ל״ה with Suffixes

VERBS ל״ה

		1. Sing.	2. Sing. m.	2. Sing. f.
Perf. Qal.	3m.	נָחַנִי	רָאֲךָ, עָשְׂךָ	
		Pause עָשָׂנִי	קָנְךָ, עָנְךָ	
	3f.	עָשַׂתְנִי		
	2m.	בְּזִיתָנִי – רְאִיתָנִי	2S 12:10	
		Pause עֲנִיתָנִי		
	2f.	Pi. רִמִּיתָנִי		
	1c.		רְאִיתִיךָ	Pi. עִנִּתִיךְ / כִּסּוּךְ
Plur.	3c.	עָשׂוּנִי	רָאוּךָ	
	1c.		Pi. קִוִּינוּךָ	
Imp.	2m.	נְחֵנִי / עֲנֵנִי [a]		
	2f.	Hiph. הַרְאִינִי		
Plur.	2m.	Pi. כַּסּוּנִי		
Impf.	3m.	[b] יִרְאֵנִי	יִפְדְּךָ / יַחְתְּךָ	
	3f.			
	2m.		תִּשְׁבְּךָ	
	2f.	תִּרְאֵנִי		
	1c.		אֶרְאֲךָ	אֶעְדֵּךְ
Plur.	3m.		אֶעְנְךָ	
	2m.	יַעֲשׂוּנִי	Pi. יְפַתּוּךָ	
	1c.	תְּצַוֵּנִי		[illegible]
		רוֹעֵי	פּוֹדְךָ	
Part.		עוֹשֵׂנִי	P. עוֹשְׂךָ	

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

VERBS ל״ה WITH SUFFIXES

3. Sing. m.	3. Sing. f.	1. Plur.	3. Plur. m.
עָשָׂהוּ	רָאָהּ	עָשָׂנוּ	עָשָׂם
Pi. כִּלָּתוּ	Pu. צֻוְּתָה		Hiph. הֶעֱלָתַם
Pi. כִּסִּיתוֹ	עֲשִׂיתָהּ	Pu. דִּכִּיתָנוּ	עֲנִיתָם
{ עֲשִׂיתִיהוּ	רְאִיתִיהָ		רְעִיתִים
רְאִיתִיו }			
עָשׂוּהוּ	רָאוּהָ		שָׁבוּם
Pi. קִוִּינָהוּ			
		Hif. הִרְאָנוּ	רְעֵם
תְּלָוּהוּ			Hif. הִכּוּם
{ יִרְאֵהוּ	{ יִרְאֶהָ	Pu. יְצֻוֶּנּוּ	{ יֶחֱצֵם
יִלְוֶנּוּ }	יִרְאֶנָּה }		יַעֲשֵׂם }
Hiph תַּשְׁקֵהוּ			
תַּעֲשֵׂנוּ	תַּעֲשֶׂהָ	Hif. תַּתְעֵנוּ	תְּגָרֵם
			Pi תְּכַסֵּים
אֶרְאֶנּוּ	אֶעֱשֶׂנָּה		[a] אָפְדֵּם
אֶעֱנֵהוּ			
Pu. יְפֻתֶּוּהוּ	יַעֲשׂוּהָ	Pi. יְעַנּוּנוּ	
נַשְׁקֵנוּ	נַעֲשֶׂנָּה		תְּצַוֵּם
{ עוֹשׂוֹ	[1] עוֹשָׂהּ		m. [1] רוֹצָם
עוֹשֵׂהוּ }	עוֹשֶׂהָ		f. הוֹרָתָם
			pl. נֹטֵיהֶם

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

a. a]. The third radical, replaced by Yod, is retained in הַכֵּינִי 1K 20:35.37.

b. b]. In וַיֶּאֱתָיֵנִי Jb 3:25, the third radical ה is replaced by distinct Yod. The Ṣere before the suffix is changed to Pathaḥ in יִרְאַנִי Ex 33:20. Similar instances with Ṣere changed to Pathaḥ are לְרַמּוֹתַנִי 1Chr 12:17 and רֹאָנִי Is 47:10, and in the ל״א, לְהוֹצִיאָנִי Ex 14:11 (in the last two instances the Pathaḥ is in turn changed to Ḳameṣ because of pause).

c. c]. In מְפַתֶּיהָ Hos 2:16, the Yod is in place of the third radical Hē [cf. the subsequent note].

d. d]. In the Hif'il it occurs also with the suffix יהם אַפְאֵיהֶם Dt 32:26.[342]

e. e]. This Ḳameṣ is changed to Ṣere in רוֹדֵם Ps 68:28[343] and הַמַּעֲלֵם Is 63:11.

f. *Rem.* In יִקָּרֵךְ 1S 28:11, as in וָאֶכְּרֶהָ Hos 3:2, the Dagesh in the first radical is euphonic.[344] Some, however, regard the form as Nif'al, in which the Ḳameṣ under the ק is omitted on the analogy of וַיִּתְּמוּ Dt 34:8 [see above 38d].[345]

§ 42. Quadriliterals

The quadriliteral verbs occur in the following varieties:

a. 1. Verbs whose stem consists of four distinct consonantal letters.[346]

(a) On the analogy of Pi'el כִּרְסֵם, יְכַרְסְמֶנָּה Ps 80:14;[347] פַּרְשֵׁז, פַּרְשֵׁז Jb 26:9, which is either Infinitive or Perfect with Pathaḥ under the first radical in place of Ḥireḳ.

(b) On the analogy of Pu'al כֻּרְבַּל, מְכֻרְבָּל 1Chr 15:27,[348] רֻטֲפַשׁ Jb 33:25.[349] The corresponding active forms כִּרְבֵּל and רִטֲפַשׁ etc. are implied and may be so constructed.[349a]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

b. 2. Verbs whose final (fourth) radical is a quiescent Hē.

(a) On the analogy of the Pi'el תִּחֲרָה, מְתַחֲרֶה Jr 22:15, תְּתַחֲרֶה ibid 12:5;[350] שִׁפְרָה Jb 26:13;[a] טִחֲוָה; כִּמְטַחֲוֵי Gn 21:16.[352]

c. 3. Verbs in which the initial radical is doubled.

(a) On the analogy of Pi'el חַרְחֵר, לְחַרְחַר Pr 26:21, with Pathaḥ instead of Ṣere under the second ח.

d. 4. Verbs in which the initial and the middle radicals are doubled (having a ל"ה stem).

(a) On the analogy of the Pi'el שִׂגְשֵׂג, תְּשַׂגְשֵׂגִי Is 17:11; שֶׁעֲשַׁע, וְשֶׁעֲשַׁע ibid 11:8, יְשַׁעַשְׁעוּ Ps 94:19; תִּעְתַּע, מְתַעְתֵּעַ Gn 27:12; טֵאטֵא, (with quiescent second radical א), וְטֵאטֵאתִיהָ Is 14:23 [in our text וְטֵאטֵאתִיהָ, but see *Min. Sai* ad. loc.].[353]

(b) On the analogy of the Pu'al יָפְיָפָה, יָפְיָפִיתָ Ps 45:3, with Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf under the initial radical instead of Ḳibbuṣ.[354]

(c) On the analogy of the Hithpa'el מִתַּעְתְּעִים 2Chr 36:16; הִתְמַהְמָהּ [הִתְמַהְמַהּ] הִתְמַהְמָהְנוּ Gn 43:10, יִתְמַהְמַהּ Hab 2:3, וַיִּתְמַהְמָהּ Gn 19:16, with pausal Ḳameṣ in the final syllable.

e. 5. Verbs in which the initial and final radicals are doubled (derived from the ע"ו or ע"י stems).

(a) On the analogy of the Pi'el כִּלְכֵּל 2S 19:33; כִּרְכֵּר מְכַרְכֵּר ibid 6:14;[355] סִכְסֵךְ, וְסִכְסַכְתִּי Is 19:2; צִפְצֵף, הַמְצַפְצְפִים Is 8:19;[355] קִרְקֵר, וְקַרְקַר Nu 24:17, with Pathaḥ

a. Some construe this form as a regular Pi'el of שפר and as a predicate of רוּחוֹ, with pleonastic ב in בְּרוּחוֹ and with missing Dagesh in the פ of שִׁפְרָה. The Hē in שִׁפְרָה is, accordingly, a regular fem. suffix.[351]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

under the first radical instead of Hirek, as in פַּרְשֵׁז Jb 26:9 (cf. above, b), מְקַרְקַר Is 22:5, with Pathah in the final syllable in place of Sere, as in לְחַרְחַר Pr 26:21 (cf. above, e).[356]

(b) On the analogy of Pu'al כָּלְכַּל, וְכָלְכְּלוּ 1K 20:27, with Kames hatuf like in יָפְיָפִיתָ (cf. above, g).

f. 6. Verbs in which the middle and final radicals are doubled.

(a) On the analogy of Kal סְחַרְחַר Ps 38:11, with the Kames in the first radical reduced to Shewa on account of its remoteness from the tone.

(b) On the analogy of the Pu'al חֳמַרְמַר, חֳמַרְמְרָה Jb 16:16 (with final ה in place of ו [but see above, note 60a]), חֳמַרְמָרוּ La 1:20.[357]

g. 7. Verbs in which the final radical is doubled.

(a) On the analogy of the Pu'al אֻמְלַל Ps 6:3, וְאֻמְלַל Hos 4:3.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOTES: CHAPTER THREE, D

[187] In the subsequent paradigms, only the forms typical of the respective category of verbs will be given. In other forms these categories share the characteristics of the strong verbs.

The terms "strong" and "weak" were first applied to the respective categories of verbs by Dunash, after the example of the Arabic (צַחִיח = שָׁלֵם, מֻעְתַּל — מְסֻכָּן or מְסֻתָּכָן, see Bacher's *Anf.* 101). Hayyuj, likewise, employs this term מֻעְתַּלָה to designate the weak verbs, or verbs having one of the letters אהוי as one of their radicals, which in the inflexion becomes latent. Joseph Kimhi renders this Arabic term in Hebrew by מַחֲלוֹת (*Zik.* 30, etc.), while the same word employed by Ibn Janah is rendered in Ibn Tibbon's translation by עלול, from the same stem as the Arabic מעתל (*Rik.* 79, etc.). Both Hayyuj and Ibn Janah do not include the ע"ע verbs in the category of the weak verbs. Ibn Barun, however, who more nearly approaches the Arabic grammarians, regards the ע"ע verbs also as weak or irregular verbs (see *Ibn Barun*, ed. Kokowzoff, p. 60 and note 122).

[187a] Kimhi assumes, after Hayyuj (N. 48) and Ibn Janah (*Shor.* 306 and *Opusc.* 85 f.) a פ"ן stem as the basis for such forms as יִמּוֹל Gn 17:14 (cf. *Mikhlol*, ed. Lyk, 75b and *Shor.* s. v.). The forms נִמּוֹלוּ ibid 28 and נִמּוֹלִים are explained by him as Nif'al of the פָּעַל formation (see below § 37h). The form וּנְמַלְתֶּם ibid 17:11 and the talmudic לִמּוֹל in the transitive sense (assuming that Kimhi quotes from a vocalized text; see below, note 225) would seem to support such an etymology. However, modern grammarians trace all these forms to מול. But they offer no satisfactory explanation for the transitive וּנְמַלְתֶּם. Menahem 116, as well as the Karaite grammarians, operating with the biliteral theory, assume a stem מל for all these forms, (cf. 'Ali b. Suleiman's Commentary on Genesis, ed. Skoss, p. 144, note on l. 11). It is quite plausible, however, to postulate a secondary stem נמל beside מול, just as we find נסג (cf. נָסוֹג Is 59:13) beside סוג, as well as פ"י and ע"ו verbs in the same meaning (see below, § 36k). Cf. also the talmudic form הִנְמִיךְ (from) נמך alongside of נָמוֹךְ and הֵמִיךְ (from מוך).

[187b] According to Yalon, *Leshonenu* II, 121, this form belongs to the category of Kal with *i*-Imperfect, cf. לַחֲלֹק Jr 37:12. See Barth *ZDMG.*, XIII, 179 ff.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[187c] This form is, likewise, attributed by Barth (ibid.) to the Ḳal with *i*-Imperfect.

[188] The first is the view held by Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 162 and *Opusc.* 365–69) and Parḥon (s. v.), the second is that of Joseph Ḳimḥi (op. cit. 37). Modern grammarians generally refer this form either to the stem בול or to בלל (cf. Koenig I, 381 f.). The adnot. in the *Mikhlol* 75a, in which the possibility of deriving this form from בול is suggested, is by Rittenberg and not, with Koenig (ibid.), by Elias Levita. That this form may be derived from אבל *to become dry* (cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v.) is suggested by Yalon, op. cit. 117f., who takes it as a Ḳal of the *Yaktil* formation, like וַיֵּרֶב for וַיֶּאֱרֹב, cf. below, note 190a.

[189] So Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 166) with reference to וַיָּגֶר, while וַיָּשַׂר is referred by him (*Shor*. 534) to the stem שרר. On מְשׂוֹר Is 10:15, however, he remarks (ibid.) that it may be derived from the פ״ן stem, on the analogy of מַבּוּעַ Ec 2:16, in the sense in which this word is used in the Mishna (Shab. 4,1 and Suk. 1,6). Joseph Ḳimḥi (op. cit. 15 and 36 f.) refers both the verb and the noun to the פ״ן stem. Cf. also note 508 below. The forms וַיָּגֶר and וַיָּשַׂר are taken by most of the modern grammarians as regular ע״י verbs.

[190] The Nun is regarded as expletive by David b. Abraham (*Jāmi' al-Alfāẓ*, ed. Skoss, II, 756) as well as by Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 215 f.), like that of אָבְדַן Es 8:6 and אָבְדָן ibid 9:5 (see above § 17c). According to Koenig I, 305, however, this Nun is a "parasitic appendage," invented by popular need in order to preserve the etymological connection in the Infinitive with the stem נתן, which connection has become almost extinct in the usual form תֵּת.

[190a] The change of the Ṣere to Segol in the form with Maḳḳef is, of course, normal, since a Ṣere cannot remain in a closed unaccented syllable.

[191] Cf. also Ḥayyuj (*Noviye Materiali*, Arab. text, 202). Ben Ḥisdai, quoted by Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 86) and Ibn Ezra (*Moz*. 32a and *S*. 52a), refers these forms to a secondary stem נקח, since, in his opinion, the assimilation of the ל is inconceivable. This is, however, erroneous, for the assimilation of the ל is not uncommon in the Semitic languages (cf. Brock., *Sem. Sprachw.* p. 79). Some of the moderns see in the assimilation of the ל of לקח the influence of the פ״ן antonym נתן (cf. Ges.-K.-Bergstrasser § 19a). The assimilation of the ל in the case of this verb is peculiar to all the Canaanite dialects, in which the root has been found, and to Aramaic, see Harris, *Development of the Canaanite Dialects*, 8 f.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[192] This is apparently at the suggestion of Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 248). The moderns emend it to read לְקָחַם or וָאֶקָּחֵם (cf. Ges.-K. §§ 19i and 66g, also Bauer-Leander 366).

[193] So also Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 250 and *Riḳ.* 145). But in *Shor.* 546f. he derives it from the stem חעה and construes it as a forma mixta, combining the Perfect and Imperfect forms of the Nif'al (נִתְעוּ and יִתָּעוּ). So also Ibn Ezra (*Moz.* 19b). Modern grammarians generally refer it to the stem נתע (=נתץ), cf. Ges.-Buhl, s. v., but also Ben Yehuda s. v.

[194] Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 80 and *Shor.* 214) derives it from כול, so also Ḳimḥi in *Shor.* s. v. The etymological explanation of Joseph Ḳimḥi is accepted by Koenig I, 390. On the meaning of this word cf. Ben Yehuda s. v.

[195] Cf. above § 25k, also Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 366ff. and *Riḳ.* 40) and Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Ziḳ.* 35). In his Addenda to *Ziḳḳaron*, p. 73, Bacher quotes the view of one signed אש"ר צעי"ר המדקדקים found in a note in one of the MSS., according to which נַיַּדְרְכוּ, נַיַּדְבְּקוּ, as well as נַיַּדְבֵּק Gn 31:23, are to be construed rather as Ḳal, with Pathaḥ under the Yod preformative in place of Ḥireḳ. This seems to be in consonance with Barth's treatment of such verbal forms, regarding them as Ḳal with *i*-Imperfect (cf. *ZDMG.*, XL III, pp. 179ff., also below note 200). Cf. an extension of this principle to other forms in the Bible by Yalon, Leshonenu II 16ff.

[196] The same criticism against Ḥayyuj is leveled by Ibn Ezra (*Ṣ.* 3ab and *Yesod Mispar*, attached to Pinsker's *Mabo*, 136; see also Pinsker's note ad loc.). Ḥayyuj's view is, however, adopted by Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 162 and *Opusc.* 367); while the moderns accept the etymology of Ibn Ezra and Ḳimḥi, which may be prompted by sound linguistic sense, since the dropping of a preformative in a living tongue is hardly conceivable. However, it may be argued that the Waw in וָאַבֶּדְךָ marks a further step in the quiescing of the א, as found in וָאעַנֶּה and וָאעַשִּׁיר, the stages in this development being וְאאַבֶּדְךָ>וָאאַבֶּדְךָ>וָאַבֶּדְךָ. Cf. also below מְסַכְּרַת, הַסּוּרִים, וַיֵּרֶ ב, which may have developed along the same lines. The א dropped would, accordingly, be the preformative, not the radical.

[197] Cf. Ges.K. § 68b, note 2, where this form is similarly explained; namely, on the ground of dissimilation. So also, generally, the moderns. This explanation is ascribed by Ibn Ezra (cf. *Ṣ.* 50b) to Ibn Chiquitilla, but it is found already in Ibn Janaḥ's *Riḳma* (p. 203). Some of the moderns construe the form as belonging to the category of *i*-Imperfect

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

(יִקְטֹל), where the quiescent א causes the lengthening of the Pathaḥ to Ḥolem, cf. rā'sh>ראש (see Lambert § 889); but the Arabic ya'kul, and the Aramaic יֵאכֻל, as well as the Imperative in Hebrew אֱכֹל seem to militate against such an etymology.

[198] In his *Shor.* s. v. and commentary ad loc. Ḳimḥi construes this form, after Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 63), as a noun of the פּוֹעִיל formation like אוֹפִיר. So also Efodi (*Ma'ase Efod* 129) and, of the modern grammarians, Boettcher II, p. 436. The latter considers this a diminutive form, but see Koenig I, 392. Most of the modern grammarians (quoted by Koenig ibid.), however, prefer to take it as Hif'il. In his comment. ad loc. Ibn Ezra takes it as a noun, but he quotes Ibn Janaḥ as having regarded it as Hif'il for אַאֲכִיל.

[199] Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 22) regards it as Ḳal, like וָאוֹמְרָה. So also Ibn Ezra in his commentary ad loc., who construes it as a denominative from אוֹצָר. Ḳimḥi's suggestion offered here to construe it as Hif'il is generally adopted by modern grammarians (quoted by Koenig I, 391). Some, however, read here וָאֶצְּרָה as ibid 7:2 (Ges.-K. § 53n).

[199a] Ibn Janaḥ mentions both views (*Opusc.* 23), the latter of which is favored by Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Ziḳ.* 4). Instances where the vowel of the laryngeal (especially in the case of א) is thrown back under the preceding vowelless consonant are not uncommon in Hebrew; cf. כְּאַבִּיר Is 10:13 (for כְּאַבִּיר), מְלָאכָה (for מַלְאָכָה), מָאתַיִם (for מְאָתַיִם); cf. also below, note 278. The omission of the silent א would then be the next logical step; thus וַיַּאֲרֵב>וַיֶּאֱרַב>וַיָּרֶב. Cf. also the following note. Modern grammarians are divided in their opinions on these two forms, וַיָּאצֶל and וַיָּרֶב, most of them preferring to regard them as Hif'il, for וַיַּאֲצֶל and וַיַּאֲרֵב (cf. Koenig I, 390). Barth, however, takes וַיָּאצֶל, with Boettcher (II, 436), as Ḳal of the יִקְעַל formation (*ZDMG* 43, 179).

[200] Ḳimḥi evidently follows Ḥayyuj (N. 15) in construing this form as Hif'il (for יַאֲהִל). Modern grammarians, however, take it as Pi'el (for יְאַהֵל), with the elision of the א, like וַתְּזְרֵנִי (cf. below, note 203). That the א is omitted both in יַהֵל and in וַיָּרֶב (see above) was already observed by Dunash (*Tesh ag. Saadia* 54) and even earlier by David b. Abraham (cf. *Jāmi' al-Alfāẓ*, ed. Skoss, I, 436 and II, 273). The latter includes in the same category also מֵזִין (cf. below), שֵׁרִיתִךָ Jr 15:11 (cf. below, note 257), etc. Rashi (Is 13:20), likewise, notes the elision of the א in יַהֵל, מַלְּפֵנוּ and מֵזִין, construing the first two as Pi'el and the last as Hif'il. It may also be interesting to note in this connection that 'Ali b. Suleiman (11th–12th century) reads יאהל (with א

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

after the Yod) and observes that the correct reading is יהל, in the sense of יָהֵלּוּ Is 13:10 (cf. Pinsker, *Liḳ.* 141).

[201] The quiescence of the א after a Segol (<Ḥireḳ, and in turn, <Pathaḥ; cf. above, note 96) will normally yield Ṣere, cf. above § 9g; thus אֶאֱהַב (=אֶשְׁכַּב) > אֶאֱהַב > אֵהַב, etc.; cf. לֵאמֹר and לֵאלֹהִים (for לֶאֱמֹר and לֶאֱלֹהִים), see below, note 623. Cf. also the Aramaic forms יֵאכֻל Dn 4:30 (for יֶאֱכֻל), בֵּאדַיִן ibid 2:14, etc. (for בְּאֱדַיִן) etc. See also below, note 205.

[202] Ḥayyuj (N. 15–20), likewise, derives all these forms from the פ״א stem, although he admits the possibility, in the case of תֵּשַׁם, of referring it to a פ״י stem, where the original א evolved into Yod, as in תִּישַׁמְנָה Ez 6:6 (cf. ibid 19). So also Ibn Chiquitilla (cf. ed. Poznanski p. 119) and Ibn Ezra (*S. B.* 18b and *Moz.* 20b, but in his commentary ad loc. he derives both תֵּשַׁם and תֵּחַד from the פ״י). Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 193) and Parḥon 26b refer the form תֵּחַד to the stem יחד, while תֵּשַׁם is taken by modern grammarians as a Ḳal of the ע״ע verbs (see Koenig I, 339 and Ges.-Buhl s. v.). With regard to וַיֵּתָא, Ḳimḥi (*Mikh.* 86) cites a mil'el by Ben Asher and a milra' reading by Ben Naftali; cf. also *Minḥat Shai* ad loc.

[203] Ḥayyuj (N. 75) derives it from the stem ורה. Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 20), however, followed by Parḥon 3b prefers to take it as Pi'el of אור, probably after Ben Asher (*Diḳ.* 9). So also the moderns (cf. Ges.-K. § 68K).

[204] This peculiar form is variously explained by the modern grammarians. Muelau-Volck s. v. takes it, after Ḳimḥi, as Po'el. Some construe it as Ḳal for תֹּאכְלֵהוּ. Others regard it as Pi'el (for תְּאַכְּלֵהוּ = תְּאַכְּלֵהוּ), while the possibility of its being Pu'al (for תְּאֻכְּלֵהוּ) is also suggested (cf. Koenig I, 388f. and Ges.-K. § 68f.). But see above, note 144.

[205] This is the view held by Ḥayyuj (N. 15) and is generally adopted by the modern grammarians (cf. Koenig 1, 394 and Ges.-K. § 63m). However, according to the Arabic original of Ḥayyuj (Jastrow 26) this form is in place of תְּאֹהֲבוּ, on the analogy of יֶאְשְׁמוּ. So also in Ibn Ezra's translation of Ḥayyuj (D. 31). This form constituted one of the subjects of dispute between Ibn Janaḥ and Samuel ha-Nagid; the latter adhering to Ḥayyuj's view, the former construing it as Pi'el; cf. Kokowzoff, *Noviye Materiali* (text) 210 f. and (Russian text) 172; also *Opusc.* 354ff. The correct explanation of this peculiar form is probably that תְּאֹהֲבוּ (cf. יֶאְשְׁמוּ) gave rise to תֶּאֱהָבוּ (so read by Haupt), cf. לֵאמֹר for לֶאֱמֹר (see below, note 623). Thus תְּאֹהֲבוּ > תְּאָהֲבוּ > תְּאָהֲבוּ > תְּאָהֲבוּ with

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Segol lengthening to Ṣere in the open syllable caused by the quiescent א; cf. above § 9g and note 199a. By a process of distention תֵּאָהֲבוּ developed into תֶּאֱהָבוּ, perhaps in order to restore artificially the first radical which had quiesced in the Ṣere of the preformative, on the analogy of שְׁאָת (from שְׂאת), בְּאֵר (from בְּאר), רְאֵם (from רים ,ראם, Jb 39:9.10), מוֹצָאֹת Can 8:10 for מוֹצְאֹת, נוֹשְׂאוֹת 1K 10:22 for נֹשְׂאֹת (cf. below, § 39d). See also Ben Yehuda s. v. This may also bear out the theory, or the tradition, of the medieval Hebrew grammarians with reference to the pronunciation of the Shewa before a laryngeal, cf. above § 4b. See also above, note 184.

[206] The initial radical in most of the so-called פ״י verbs is really Waw, which is restored in such cases as are mentioned in category (c). The vowels of the preformatives in these verbs are plausibly explained by P. Joüon (*Grammaire de L'Hebreu Biblique*, § 75c). The Ṣere in the type יֵשֵׁב is, according to him, a contraction of יַיְשֵׁב (for יַוְשֵׁב, of the יַקְטֵל formation, cf. Arabic *ialidu* from *ualada*); while the יִירַשׁ type belongs to the category of the יִקְטַל formations; see above, note 96. The forms of the former type are in place of the more original יוֹשֵׁב, etc. (cf. נוֹשַׁב, הוֹשִׁיב, הוּשַׁב), in order to differentiate them from the Hif'il jussive and participle Ḳal; although the original form is still preserved in יוֹסֵף (Gn 4:12, Nu 22:19, Dt 13:1, Joel 2:2) and יוֹרֶה. The forms הוֹסִיף, מוֹסִיף, and מוֹרֶה are, in the opinion of this grammarian (ibid. f) modeled after the Imperfect Ḳal by false etymology. This is a more convincing explanation than those of Philippi (*ZDMG.*, XL, p. 653) and others (cf. Stade §§ 108 and 117a; and Koenig II, 508 f.). See also Wright, *Comp. Grammar* 237.

[207] This manner of compensation by adding a fem. termination instead of lengthening the vowel, is elaborately discussed by Barth, *Nb.*, Introduction XIIIf., in his treatment of the Law of Compensation. Cf. also Ges.-K. § 69 C. This idea was originally suggested by Ḥayyuj (N. 21) for the פ״י verbs and was extended to apply also to the Infinitives of the פ״ן by Ibn Chiquitilla (cf. Ibn Ezra, comment. to Ex 2:4). Poznanski sees in this suggestion the influence of Arabic grammarians (cf. *Ibn Chiquitilla* 127f.).

[207a] This etymology is already found in Menaḥem 113, also in *Jāmi' al-Alfāẓ* by David b. Abraham, ed. Skoss II, 274 and 727. Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 153f.) seems to be at a loss in regard to this form and suggests a stem ללה, of which לֶלֶת is either an adjective or a Perfect with a ת for ה, as in וּשְׁכֻרַת Is 51:21 and עָשָׂת Lv 25:21. It is, however, fairly probable that לֶלֶת is to be traced back to לֶלֶדֶת, the basic form

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

of לֶלֶדֶת, on the analogy of אַחַת from the original אַחַדְתְּ and מְשָׁרַת 1K 1:15 for מְשָׁרַתְתְּ>מְשָׁרַתַת; cf. above, note 138; also Gordon, Ugaritic Grammar, 20.

[208] According to Ḥayyuj (N. 31) the Waw in שׁוּב represents the transposed initial radical Yod. Modern grammarians accept Ḳimḥi's opinion with regard to the apheresis of שׁוּב (cf. Koenig I, 402f. and Ges.-K. § 69g). This opinion was previously suggested by Ibn Ezra in his commentary to Jb 42:2, although he does not favor it in regard to כֹּל תּוּכָל.

[209] Similarly Koenig I, 422 and Ges.-K. § 48 l. In our text the reading is דֵּעָה, which is also that given by Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik*. 42).

[210] This form is so construed by Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc*. 176f. and *Rik*. 50), over against Ḥayyuj (N. 97) who refers it to the stem לשע or נשע and compares it to וְאֶקְחָה and נִסְעָה, in which the Dagesh in the second radical is omitted for the sake of euphony.

[211] So in his commentary ad l. (=תְּנוּ), also Rashi ad l. (לשון הזמנה כמו הָבָה נִתְחַכְּמָה). Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 14), followed by Parḥon s. v., takes it as apheretic for אֶהֱבוּ, like קַח Ez 17:5 and תַּתָּה 2S 22:41 from לָקַח and נָתַתָּ, with the repetition of אָהֲבוּ to indicate emphasis. Various explanations of this peculiar form are offered by modern grammarians (cf. Koenig I, 395). Some construe it as apheretic for יָהֲבוּ (they gave); others as a *Ketaltal* form (for אֲהַבְהָבוּ), thus attaching it to the preceding אָהֲבוּ (cf. below § 42f).

[212] Ḥayyuj (N. 24 and 81) regards both as Nif'al. Ibn Chiquitilla, however, in his adnot. to p. 81 s. v. ירה, advances in the name of *Yesh 'Omrim*, the opinion attributed here by David Ḳimḥi to his father, with regard to יִיָּרֶה, while already Rashi ad Gn 8:12, regards וַיִּיָּחֶל as Hithpa'el. According to Lambert, p. 355, note 1, the correct reading of יִיָּרֶה is יִיָּרֶה, which is in place of יוּרֶה a passive of the Ḳal; cf. וַיִּישָׂם and יִיסַף (for יוּשַׂם and יוּסַף, see below, k). This is on the assumption that the *u* and *i* in Hebrew are kindred in pronunciation, cf. Lambert 364, and above, notes 16 and 93.

[213] The first is the opinion of Ḥayyuj (N. 24), the second that of Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc*. 27f.). The dropping of the Yod in the Nif'al, according to Ibn Janaḥ, is due to the phonetic difficulty of having two sucessive letters with Dagesh, as is also the case of תִּגָּל (for תִּנָּגֵל; cf. above § 34k). The rejection of the Yod and the Nun in these instances may therefore be taken as cases of haplology. Modern grammarians, however, derive וַיָּחֶל with Joseph Ḳimḥi, from the stem חול (Koenig I, 506).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[214] Thus Ḥayyuj (N. 26) with reference to נוּלְּדוּ: "the Waw of נולד is indeed absorbed in the ל, which, accordingly, takes Dagesh in נוּלְּדוּ, the Nun receiving Shureḳ, which is easier to pronounce than Ḥolem." Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 93) construes it as a forma mixta, composed of Nif'al and Pu'al, like נְגוֹאֲלוּ Is 49:3 (see above, note 124), with the Nun receiving the vowel of the rejected Yod. No definite or plausible explanation of this form is offered by the modern grammarians (cf. Koenig I, 408.433). Koenig himself (ibid.) approves the opinion of Ḳimḥi, after Ḥayyuj; namely, that the *u* vowel in נוּלְּדוּ resulted from the sharpening of the ל.

[215] This opinion is quoted by Ibn Ezra in his commentary ad loc. from Ibn Chiquitilla, but it is also considered as "not improbable" by Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 190). It is generally accepted by modern grammarians (cf. Koenig I, 427 and Ges.-K. § 69w).

[216] Modern grammarians are at sea in their explanations of these peculiar forms (cf. Koenig I, 421f. and Ges.-K. § 70c). A rather plausible explanation is offered by Pinsker (*Mabo* 115f.) on the basis of the earlier Babylonian system of vocalization (cf. above, note 147), in which the Ṣere of the regular forms יֵיטִיב, יֵילִיל, etc., is written above the second Yod (ייטיב, ייליל). In transferring this vocalization to the Tiberian system, Pinsker maintains, the scribe inadvertenly vocalized these forms יְיֵלִיל, יְיֵטִיב, etc., retaining the Ṣere under the second Yod, to which a subsequent scribe added a shewa under the first vowel-less Yod. It is also possible to explain these instances, as well as יְיֵדַע, on the same principle as operates in the distention of תְּאֵהֲבוּ Pr 1:22 (cf. above, note 205), the original reading being that of Ḥayyuj (יֵילִיל), but evolved into יְיֵלִיל in an attempt to restore artificially in pronunciation the radical Yod.

[217] Another instance of this type mentioned by Ḳimḥi in his commentary to Is 8:10, is גֹּשׁוּ Jos 3:9, where, in like manner, the first radical is omitted in the Imperative; cf. also גֹּשִׁי Ru 2:14. This would imply an Imperfect יגֹשׁ. These forms are so explained by Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 39), but Ibn Ezra ascribes this explanation to Ibn Chiquitilla (cf. Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. p. 93, note 32). In *Riḳ*., 204, Ibn Janaḥ mentions this etymology, but he rejects it as improbable for the following reasons: (1) the Imperfect יִגֹּשׁ implied by these Imperative forms never occurs; (2) even if this Imperfect did occur, such forms in the Imperative would be possible only in pause; cf. עֲמֹדוּ Na 2:9, etc. He therefore regards these forms as peculiar. Modern grammarians fail to explain these forms, but according to Bauer-Leander 367 they are to be traced to the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

analogical influence of בּוֹאוּ and בָּאִי. As for עֻוצו, Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 39) suggests the possibility of deriving it from the stem עוץ, which evolved from יעץ by metathesis (cf. subsequent note). This suggestion is accepted also by Ibn Ezra (*Ṣ.* 52a).

218 Cf. Ḥayyuj (N. 43) and Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 209). Verbs in this category may be explained, according to these grammarians, either on the principle of metathesis, the first and second radicals interchanging, or merely as cognate stems kindred in meaning. Thus Ibn Janaḥ (ibid.) gives a long list of examples belonging respectively to פ"י and ע"ו, or to ע"ו and ל"ה, which are kindred in meaning. Ḳimḥi (Lyck ed. 89a) adds also instances of the stem ע"ע, which are semantically related to their respective cognates in the ע"י and ל"ה, e. g. שנג — שנה, שרר — שרה — שור, מצץ — מצה — מיץ, חתת — חתה — חית, שחת — שחה — שוח. Cf. also references in Ibn Ezra's works listed by Bacher in his *Ibn Ezra* etc., p. 93, note 33. Some of the modern grammarians take the forms יֵבוש, יֵאות and יֵאור, as *yiḳtal* formations of the ע"ו stem, in which the Ḥireḳ of the preformative is lengthened to Ṣere in the open syllable, while the Pathaḥ changes, by the obscuration of the Waw to Ḥolem; thus *yi-băsh* (or *yibăwsh*) > *yi-bāsh* > *yē-bōsh*, etc. (cf. Ges.-K. § 72h, also Koenig I, 446). Koenig prefers to see in these forms, after Ewald, the analogical influence of the intransitive ע"ע formations, e. g. יֵקַל, etc. (cf. below § 38d). A more plausible explanation is, perhaps, that offered by Bauer-Leander § 56 f and y, according to which these are verbalized forms of the nominal ā (>o) formations. Thus the nominal forms בוש and אור will yield the verbal Imperfect forms יֵבוש and יֵאור, the Ṣere (<Ḥireḳ) under the preformative bearing testimony to the late state in the development of these formations, for in an earlier state, the preformative would have taken a Ḳameṣ (<Pathaḥ) instead of Ṣere.

219 This is the view held by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 32) and Ibn Ezra (*Moz.* 7b and short commentary to Ex 30:32), over against Ḥayyuj (N. 57), who mentions but rejects it as "remote". In his commentary to Gn 50:26 Ibn Ezra ascribes this view to Ibn Janaḥ, while in that to Mi 1:7 he refers it to Samuel ha-Nagid. In both instances, however, he rejects it as improbable and construes וַיִּישֶׂם and יִיסַךְ as Imperfect Ḳal of פ"י (ישם and יסך), apparently after Ḥayyuj (N. 58). In *Riḳ.* 51 and *Opusc.* 371 Ibn Janaḥ adduces further instances in which Shureḳ and Ḥireḳ interchange; cf. also above, notes 16, 93 and 212. Ibn Janaḥ's opinion is also accepted by Ewald § 131d, Boettcher § 460, Tuch and Dlm. on Gn 24:33; but see Koenig I, 435 f. and Ges.-K.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

§ 73. Some of the moderns explain these forms as passive Ḳal (cf. above, note 146).

[220] So Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 200), who, however, derives it from the stem נוח. Although the stem ינח is recorded in *Shor*. 196, Ibn Janaḥ prefers to regard all the forms given there as belonging to the ע״ו stem (cf. *Shor*. 291 f., and *Riḳ*. 146 and 200 f.) This etymology is generally adopted by modern grammarians (quoted by Koenig I, 502), who refer all the forms with sharpened Nun to the category of יַסִּית Is 36:18 (from סות), הִזִּילוּהָ La 1:8 (from זול), etc. (see below § 37p and note 253), in which the quasi-Aramaic variation in form probably serves to indicate a difference in meaning; thus הֵנִיחַ *caused to rest*, הִנִּיחַ *set down*, etc. As to וְהֻנִּיחָה, Gesenius (*Lgb*. 389 and *Thes*. s. v. נוח) regards it as analogous to הֳקִימַת Dn 7:4, but perhaps a more plausible suggestion is that offered by Ges.-K. § 72ee to read it, with Klosterman after the LXX, וְהִנִּיחָהּ. On the interchange of Ḥireḳ and Shureḳ (or Ḳibbuṣ) see above, notes 16, 93, and 219.

[221] According to Ḥayyuj (N. 28), more distinctly explained by Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc*. 137), this is a יִתְפַּעֵל form, like וְיִשְׁתַּמֵּר Mi 6:16, in which the first radical is transposed and, in the present instance, quiesces in the Ṣere of the first Taw. So also Ibn Ezra (*Ṣ*. 67a and commentary ad loc.) and, of the modern grammarians, Vater and Shultens (recorded by Gesenius in *Lgb*. 386 f.). Most of the modern grammarians, however, regard it as a corruption of וַתִּתְיַצֵּב (cf. Olsh. § 79b; Ges.-K. § 71; Koenig I, 430). An explanation similar to that of Ḳimḥi is given by the anonymous author of the *Hebrew Grammar*, published by Poznanski, p. 16.

[222] Ḥayyuj (N. 29) takes it, according to the elaborate interpretation of Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 41–46), as Imperfect and reads וְיֵצְקוּ, with Metheg under the Yod to indicate the quiescence of the Yod radical. Ibn Janaḥ, himself, however, construes it as Imperative, with Metheg under the Yod as in מִשְׁכוּ Ex 12:21. On the incorporation of Ibn Janaḥ's opinion in the Hebrew text of Ḥayyuj (ed. Nutt), see editor's note, *Opusc*. 41.

[223] Ibn Janaḥ, likewise, prefers to regard them as פ״י verbs, although he also suggests the possibility of referring them to the ע״ע verbs, on the analogy of יֵמַר Is 24:9 and וָאֵקַל Gn 16:5 (*Shor*. 425); cf. below § 38d. In *Riḳ*. 209, however, he construes them as ע״ו forms. Modern grammarians derive them from the ע״ע stems; cf. Ges.-K. § 67p and dd.

[224] So also Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 228), but he reads, with our text, צְאֶינָה

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

וּרְאֶינָה. The principle of assonance was already recognized by Ḥayyuj (N. 43) with regard to מוּבָאֶךָ. Cf. also Joseph Ḳimḥi, *Galui* 6.

225 That vocalized copies of the Talmud existed during the middle ages seems to be evident on the basis of many references and quotations by the medieval grammarians; cf. *Riḳ.* 124, note 2, *Ziḳ.* 8, and *Ma'ase 'Efod* 21 (ולזה תמצא כל ספרי המשנה הקודמים כתובים עם הנקוד והטעמים). But apparently even long before Ibn Janaḥ, Mishna texts, provided with accents of the so-called Palestinian system, were in vogue; cf. Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens* I, 28 f.

226 This explanation is offered by Ḥayyuj (N. 30) and is also accepted by Koenig I, 639. But we most likely have in this form another example illustrating the close kinship between the ל״א and the ל״ה verbs (cf. above, note 121), the intended form being יְראוּ or יְרוּ.

227 In his treatment of the forms of this stem Ḳimḥi, in the main, follows Ḥayyuj (N. 24).

228 According to Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 355 f. and *Shor.* 193) וַיֵּחַמּוּ and וַיֵּחַמְנָה may be taken as Pi'el, but this etymology is not accepted by most of the subsequent grammarians. Ibn Ezra (commentary ad loc.) construes them, after Ḥayyuj (loc. cit.), as Ḳal forms. So also the moderns (cf. Ges.-K. § 69f). See also note 230 below.

229 This form is derived by most of the modern grammarians from the ע״ע stem חמם (cf. Koenig I, 365 f. and Ges.-K. § 67g). This etymology does not, however, seem plausible.

230 According to Koenig I, 417, after Boettcher II, 138, the preformative Yod in this form, in place of the usual fem. preformative ת, serves to indicate the reference to the males of the cattle. Other grammarians (Ew § 191b, Ges.-K. § 47k) see in this form the influence of the cognate languages (Western Aramaic, Arabic, Ethiopic, and Assyrian), in which יִקְטְלְנָה is the regular form of the third plur. feminine; cf. also וַיִּשַּׁרְנָה 1S 6:12.

231 So also Ibn Janaḥ in *Opusc.* 28f. and *Riḳ.* 94. But in *Shor.* 158 he derives it from the stem חמם, on the analogy of נֵאָרִים Mal 3:9 (from ארר), cf. below § 38n and note 286. So also the modern grammarians (Ges.-K. § 67u and Bauer-Leander 434).

232 But above § 31g (ed. Lyk 33a) Ḳimḥi gives the reading לְיֵחָמֶנָּה. This reading is found in most MSS. (לְיֵחָמֶנָה, cf. Koenig I, 420). According to Barth (*AJSL*, XVII, 200) the ending ֶ◌נָּה is a pronominal suffix in the third person, plur. fem., for ָ◌נָה, with the original sharpening of the pronominal suffix Nun (*hinna*); cf. קִרְבֶּנָּה Gn 41:21 (for קִרְבָּנָה). The Segol in place of Ḳameṣ is due, according to him, to the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

analogical influence of the ל"ה nouns ending in ֶ־ָה (e. g. שָׂדֶה), which should yield normally ֶ־ֱנָה. But the evolution of the Ḳameṣ-Ḳameṣ into the Segol-Ḳameṣ series is not uncommon in Hebrew, cf. above, note 68. Barth's forced explanation of the Segol is therefore unnecessary.

[233] Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 192) records a reading מְוֹיעִין by his "countrymen" (בְּנֵי אַרְצֵנוּ) on the analogy of מְרִיקִים Gn 42:35, thus deriving it from the ע"י stem. This reading is condemned by Ibn Janaḥ, for this form clearly belongs, in his opinion, to the פ"י stem. He, therefore, suggests the reading מְוֹיעִין, on the analogy of מַצִּיב 1S 15:2. The modern talmudic lexicographers generally regard it as a ע"י verb. Ḳimḥi's etymology seems, however, quite plausible, particularly in view of the Arabic equivalent (cf. Noeld., *Neue Beitr.* 194f.). The analogy of מַצִּיב adduced by Ibn Janaḥ in support of the reading מְוֹיעִין is untenable, for the assimilation of the Yod radical takes place only when the Yod is followed by צ.

[234] So Ḥayyuj (N. 25) and some of the moderns (cf. Koenig I, 407; Ges.-K. § 69r). Accordingly, stating it in modern terminology, the ground-form יִוְכַּל* gave rise to יוּכַל (cf. נוֹלַד<*נִוְלַד), and, through a depression of the Ḥolem, to יוּכַל (cf. below, note 329). The form תּוּקַד Lv 6:5 etc. alongside of תִּיקַד Dt 32:22 and Is 10:16 may also belong in this category. Similar instances are adduced by Wright (*Comp. Gr.* 89) and by Ges.-K. (op. cit.) from Arabic and vulgar Arabic. Ḳimḥi is, however, incorrectly quoted by the latter (ibid.) as attributing this change to the danger of confusing יוּכַל with אוּכַל, just as in the case of אֶפְעַל for אִפְעַל (cf. above § 22m), because of similarity in the sound of Alef and Yod, since he merely alludes in this particular instance (ed. Lyk 93a) to the possibility of confusing אוּכַל from אָכַל with אוּכַל from יָכֹל. The need of differentiating an Alef from a Yod is felt only in instances of these consonants with Ḥireḳ or Ṣere (cf. above, note 107), because of the phonetic kinship between these sounds and the Yod, but in the case of any other vowels there is no danger of confusing these consonants. It is also quite likely that both in תּוּקַד (beside תִּיקַד) and in יוּכַל (beside the Aramaic יִכַּל) we have further examples of the interchange of *u* and *i*, cf. above, note 219.

[235] So Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 195) and Ibn Ezra (commentary ad loc.) who adduce the analogy of וְהַ יְנִקֵהוּ in the same verse. That this form "probably arose merely through confusion with the following הֵ יְנִקֵהוּ" is suggested also by Ges.-K. § 69x. Saadia, however, construes it as a composite of two words; namely, הֵא=הִי and לָךְ=לִיכִי (cf. Ibn Ezra,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

loc. cit.); cf. b. Sota 12b. The view that two verbs (הלך and ילך) exist in the same meaning is advanced by Ḥayyuj (N. 7) and is adopted by Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit.).

235a The orthographic confusion of forms from אסף with those from יסף is not uncommon in the Bible; cf. וַיֹּסֶף 2S 6:1, תֹּסֵף Ps 104:29, אֹסִפְךָ 1S 15:6, אֹסְפָה Mi 4:6. It is interesting to note that the same confusion, with reference to verbs of thse two stems, obtains also in some texts of the Mishna; cf. Epstein, I. N., *Ha-Tekufah*, XIII, 508f. All these froms are taken by Boettcher II, 436, and by Barth, *Nb.* 136, as Ḳal of the יִקְטֹל formation; cf. above, notes 195, 196 and 206.

236 David b. Abraham, *Jāmi' al-Alfāẓ*, ed. Skoss II, 607 and Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 50 and *Shor.* 205) derive this form from ירט. So also Parḥon s. v. David b. Abraham compares it to the Arabic stem ורט *turn down*. Modern grammarians are divided in their views (cf. Koenig I, 544f.). Koenig himself prefers to take it as a ל״ה verb.

237 Cf. *Opusc.* 52f. and below § 40 h'. This opinion is attributed by Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik.* 42) to Samuel ha-Nagid and is said to have been rejected by Ibn Janaḥ in favor of deriving it from the ל״ה stem. This does not, however, seem to be borne out by the available works of Ibn Janaḥ, for also in *Shor.* 207 this form is referred to the פ״י stem. It is regarded as a פ״י noun also by some of the modern grammarians (Koenig II, 36 and 488, Ges.-Buhl s. v.), while others suggest emendations.

238 On the controversy as to the triliterality of the verbs in this category see above, note 81.

239 But Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 87) regards this form, as well as עוֹלַל La 1:12, as Po'el (cf. the subsequent note), although they have Pathaḥ in the second syllable. According to Ḳimḥi (*Mikh.*, 106a and 131b) all the forms with Pathaḥ belong to ע״ע stems.

240 This is then more accurately a Po'lel, or Hithpo'lel, formation, with quiescent middle radical (cf. Ḳimḥi, op. cit. 98b and 106a). So Ḥayyuj (N. 47) and Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 55). The more general term Po'el is employed by them merely for the sake of simplicity; but it is rejected by Ibn Ezra, who distinctly terms it, after Ibn Chiquitilla, Po'lel (cf. *Ṣ.* 64a and *Safah Berurah* 40b). But the Waw in the ע״ע verbs of this formation (סוֹבֵב) is regarded by all of them as a vowel-letter, the formation being, accordingly, Po'lel (cf. Ḥayyuj, N. 41).

241 Cf. Ḥayyuj (N. 33). Ben Naftali reads רָאמָה for רָאֲמָה (cf. Ges.-K. § 72p). Koenig I, 439, on the other hand, suggests the reading קָאֵם in place of קָאם and sees in these forms an attempt to introduce a

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

third consonant, under the analogical effect of the preponderant triconsonantal stems. See below § 38a and note 270; cf. also the Syriac forms of the mediae Waw, קָאֵם. The Ḳameṣ in קָם etc. represents a contraction of *ăă*, after the Waw had been normally elided between two short vowels, cf. below, note 245. Thus *ḳă(w)ăma*>*ḳăăma*> *ḳāma*>קָם. The long *ā* should normally yield, in Hebrew, *ō* (cf. *ḳātil*> קוֹטֵל, etc.; see Wright, *Comp. Gr. 84f.*); but in this instance, as well as in a number of others (cf. below, notes 301a and 514) the Ḳameṣ is probably due to the Aramaic influence, where the passing of the long *ā* into Ḳameṣ is normal. Ḳimḥi, in his treatment of the forms מֵת(<מָוֵת= חָפֵץ) and בּוֹשׁ (<בָּוֵשׁ=קָטֹן) follows Ḥayyuj (N. 34 and 42). Similarly some of the moderns (Ges.-K. § 72n). But others take them as verbalized nominal forms (<מֵת=גֵּר and בּוֹשׁ=אוֹר, substantives); cf. Bauer-Leander 392, alsc Lambert 360.

[242] According to Geiger (*Ḳebuṣath Ma'amarim*, ed. Kirchheim, pp. 87–92), there were three types of vocalization in the Perfect Ḳal of the ע"ו: (1) where the first radical when accented always had Ḳameṣ קָ קָ תָּ׳, but קַמְתֶּם and וְקַמְתֶּם); (2) with Pathaḥ under the first radical in all cases, even in the third person, sing. masc. (קַם) in order to distinguish it from the nominal form; (3) with Ḳameṣ in the third person and Pathaḥ in all others. The first reading is that of Judah Halevi, Ibn Ezra, Parḥon, and perhaps, Ḥayyuj. The second reading is found in the works of Ibn Bal'am and Judah Hadassi. The third is a sort of compromise reading and is represented by Ḳimḥi and his successors and by our texts. So, apparently, also Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 202) and Ibn Chiquitilla (cf. *Ibn Chiquitilla*, ed. Poznanski, 119). See also Luzzatto's letter to Kirchheim in *Riḳ.* 204f. But the shortening of the long vowel in a closed syllable is of early Semitic origin, cf. Bauer-Leander § 26b. The vocalization with Ḳameṣ under the accented first radical may, therefore, be traced to the influence of Aramaic; cf. Lambert, *REJ*, XVIII, 125f.; while the reading of Pathaḥ in the third person, masc. sing., may be merely an artificial attempt to differentiate the verbal form (i. e. Perfect) from the nominal (participle or substantive), and may also be due to the influence of the ע"ע verbs. According to the biliteralists the forms with Pathaḥ (קַמְתָּ, קַמְתֶּם) are primary, while the forms with Ḳameṣ are secondary. The latter evolved, by analogy, from forms in which the short vowel was lengthened because it was in an open syllable and received the accent, e. g. **ḳama*>*ḳáma*> קָם. On the same principle, the form *iaḳumu* and *iaḳimu* (>*iaḳûmu* and *iaḳîmu*) in the Imperfect yielded יָקוּם and יָקִים (indicative), and

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

יָקֹם and יָקֻם (jussive). Cf. Frank R. Blake, *Studies in Semitic Grammar* II, *JAOS.*, LII, 2, p. 109ff.

[243] The close proximity of the ע is mentioned as the reason for the tone in the ultima in this word also by Ges.-K. § 73d and by Koenig I, 511. Generally, before a word beginning with a laryngeal the tone shifts to the ultima in numerous similar instances, cf. examples quoted below, d and f, also הָבָה אֶת־אִשְׁתִּי Gn 29:21, לָמָּה אַתֶּם 2S 19:11 and always before יהוה (= אֲדֹנָי); see also below, note 608.

[244] This is the opinion of Ḥayyuj (N. 52), which is generally adopted by the modern grammarians (cf. Ges.-K. § 44d and Koenig I, 441).

[245] This is contrary to Ḥayyuj (N. 34), who regards the Waw as a radical and not as Waw of Prolongation. Ḥayyuj distinctly warns against the "error" of considering the Waw in these cases as Waw of Prolongation. A converse inconsistency is found in Ibn Ezra, who regards this Waw as a radical (*Moz.* 7a), although he definitely shares the view of Samuel ha-Nagid as to the biliterality of the עו״י and ע״ע (ibid. 41b; cf. also above, note 81). Ḳimḥi's is the sounder view, since even on the assumption of the triliteral theory, the Waw and the Yod disappear between two short vowels in early Semitics (cf. Brock., *GvG.* I, 57). Hence, *yaḳŭwŭmu* (cf. *yaḳ[u]tulu*) > *yaḳŭŭmu* > *yaḳūmu* (יָקוּם) cf. also below, note 247.

[246] This may be due to false phonology, which regards the Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf as Ḳameṣ and, consequently, under the effect of the laryngeals, influences the change to Pathaḥ. Cf. also Ges.-K. § 72t and ff; and Koenig I, 495f. and 517f.

[247] In point of fact the Ḳameṣ of the preformative really represents the original Pathaḥ (*năḳtăl* < *năḳtăla*) lengthened in an open syllable before the tone, as in יָקוּם (cf. above, note 96); while the Ḥolem may be traced back to a long *a*, the latter having arisen as a result of the elision of the Waw between two short vowels and the contraction of the two short vowels to ā (cf. above, note 245). Thus *naḳăwăma* (cf. *naḳătăla*) > *naḳăăma* > *naḳāma* > *naḳōm* (נָקוֹם).

[248] According to modern grammarians (cf. Koenig I, 498) this form follows the example of the strong verbs (נִקְטַל) and is analogous to נָמוֹל Gn 17:26f. from מול, cf. above, note 120). Koenig I, 499, suggests that this form arose as "mechanical imitation" of the Imperfect יֵעוֹר, which occurs six times in the Bible (Jr 6:22, etc.). This is the regular form in mishnic Hebrew, which probably evolved in consonance with Koenig's explanation, e. g. נִידּוֹן Rosh ha-Shanah I:2; נִיזּוֹנֶת Keth. XI:1; etc. Cf. Albrecht, *Neuhebräische Grammatik*, München, 1913, p. 125.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[249] Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 134) construes it as a Perfect, with the feminine characteristic ת in place of ה as in וְשָׁבַת Ez 46:11. The context, however, requires a participle. Ḳimḥi's explanation of this form, namely, that it is a segolatization of נְפוֹצָה, is quite plausible; cf. שְׁלֹשֶׁת and שְׁלֹשָׁה, etc.

[250] In our text וְהֵיטִיבוֹתִי, with Yod after the ה as was read also by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 203, cf. also note ad loc. by Baer), who regards this form as composed of the Hif'il of פ"י (יטב) and ע"ו (טוב). Most of the modern grammarians take it as Hif'il of טוב (for הֲטִיבוֹתִי), while some refer it to the פ"י (for הֵיטַבְתִּי); cf. Koenig I, 462f. See also *Noviye Mater.*, ed. Kokowzoff (Russian text), 168f. on the controversy between Samuel ha-Nagid and Ibn Bal'am with reference to הֲטִיבוֹתָ 1K 8:18.

[251] These cases, as well as the Imperative, Infinitive and Imperfect of these forms in the last column in the paradigm tables, are regarded by Ḳimḥi, after Ḥayyuj, as apheretic Hif'il forms in which the characteristic ה was lost. To the same category he refers the forms שִׂים Gn 31:37, לִין Ju 19:9, שִׁירוּ Ex 15:27, שִׂישׂוּ Is 66:10 נִירוּ Jr 4:3, שִׁיתוּ Ps 48:14, בִּינוּ ibid 94:8, גִּילִי (milra') Zc 9:9; also לָלִין Ex 24:23, לָדִין . . . לָרִיב Is 3:13, etc. Medieval and modern grammarians are divided in their opinions in regard to thse forms. Some construe them, like Ḳimḥi, as apheretic forms of the Hif'il, while others take them as Ḳal of the ע"י (cf. Ibn Janaḥ, *Opusc.* 316f.). Ḥayyuj himself (N. 41) admits the difficulty of determining whether the middle radical in some of these verbs is Waw or Yod. Ibn Ezra, after alluding to this controversy among the grammarians, expresses himself distinctly in favor of regarding them as Hif'il (commentary to Ex 10:1). Among the modern grammarians those that hold Ḳimḥi's view are: Stade § 143c; Ewald § 127a; Ges.-K. § 73a ("it is more probable, however, that they are really shortened forms of the Hif'il"); Boettcher II, 510. Those holding the opposite view are: Schultens (quoted by Ewald, op. cit., note 3); Gesenius, *Lgb.* 408; Luzzatto, *Igroth* I, 34f.; Koenig I, 512–17; and Noeldeke, *Beitr.*, p. 34ff. The last two treat of this subject rather elaborately and exhaustively.

[251a] This is the regular Infinitive of the Haf'el in Biblical-Aramaic; see Bauer-Leander, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramaischen* § 36 o.

[252] Ḳimḥi regards it accordingly, with Ḥayyuj (N. 52), as an instance of metathesis, the vowels of the ל and the ה having interchanged. Both these grammarians refer it to the stem ע"י. Modern grammarians, however, derive it from the ע"ע stem and advance various explanations of this form (cf. Koenig I, 360f.). According to Margolis (*Feminine*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ending T in Hebrew, AJSL, XII, p. 25f.) this is an Aramaic inflection of the Infinitive form הָפֵר, where the pre-tonic vowel is reduced to Shewa, according to the Aramaic method, thus yielding הַפְרְכֶם; cf. יַרְכָה>יָרֵךְ (יַרְכָתוֹ Gn 49:13)>יַרְכָּתַי, which evolved, by backward formation, into the segolate יֶרֶךְ; cf. below, note 397.

253 These forms follow the analogy of the ע״ע verbs, with compensatory sharpening of the initial radical, according to Koenig I, 471. Others regard them as quasi-Aramaic formations (cf. below, note 273). But Kautzsch (*Orientalische Studien,* II, 771f.) considers them as genuine Hebrew forms. The deviation in vocalization may be intended, according to him, to indicate a difference in meaning; or it may be due to dissimilation (cf. יִגָּר Lv 11:7 and יִדַּל Is 17:4, in place of יָגֻר and יָדַל [of the *yaktal* formation, perhaps also to differentiate between these and the Perfect Ḳal of פ״י; cf. Wright, *Comp. Gr.* 231] corresponding to יָקוּם [of the *yaktul* formation], see above, note 96), or to euphonic reasons, the sharpening of the first radical often occurring when this radical is one of the sibilant letters.

The doubling of the first radical in these instances, as well as in some ע״ע forms (cf. below § 38d), was rather puzzling to the medieval grammarians. Ḥayyuj (Kokowzoff's *Noviye Materiali,* Arabic text, p. 34) does not take מַסִּית Jr 43:3 as a ע״ו verb, but probably as a פ״ן (cf. ibid., Russian text, p. 29, note 2); although in the case of הֻסַּג Is 59:14 and in the ע״ע forms יִתַּם Gn 47:15, אֹכַּת Dt 9:21, יִשֹּׁם Jr 19:8, יִסֹּב 1S 5:8, יַסֵּב Ex 13:18, הָשַּׁמָּה Lv 26:34, יֻכַּת Is 24:12, etc., Ḥayyuj is guided by sound etymological sense; and he correctly refers them to their respective stems, recognizing the Dagesh in the initial radical as due to backward assimilation (cf. N. 49f., 111, 113, and 119f.). He is, however, somewhat uncertain about הֻסַּג and admits the possibility of referring it to the פ״ן; but with reference to the ע״ע forms he clearly realizes the twofold manner of compensation, namely, by Dagesh or by "latent quiescent" (i. e. lengthening of the vowel under the preformative). On the other hand he construes as Nif'al the following forms: יִדֹּם Lv 10:3, תֻּתַּם Gn 47:18, יִדַּל Is 17:4, תִּדֹּמִּי Jr 48:2, יֵרַךְ ibid 51:46, יִדְּמוּ La 2:10, יִמַּךְ Ec 10:18, etc. (cf. below, note 273). Ibn Janaḥ is more consistent in his views on this grammatical phenomenon. He definitely construes as Hif'il forms of the ע״ו all the examples mentioned here by Ḳimḥi (*Opusc.* 72f., 81, 200, 202, 241; also *Riḳ.* 146), but with regard to the other instances he operates with the principle that all the forms, the Perfect of which does not occur in the Nif'al, are to be taken as Ḳal (cf. *Opusc.* 198, also

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Shor. 440). Yet he prefers to derive נִיְּחוּם Nu 4:45 from a פ״ן or פ״י stem, and he rejects Ḥayyuj's correct etymology referring it to the ע״ע (*Opusc*. 336f.). Ibn Janaḥ is equally incorrect in criticizing (*Riḳ*. 147) Ḥayyuj for explaining the Dagesh in all these instances as compensatory for the missing radical. His own explanation that the Dagesh represents the latent quiescent of the original long vowel of the preformative (cf. יוּדַק=יֻסַּב Is 28:27) is rather artificial and unfounded.

[253a] This etymology is also quoted by Ibn Ezra in his commentary ad loc. It is based, apparently, on the talmudic interpretation שלא תהא הנשמה חוזרת לנדנה (Snh. 108a). But Ḥayyuj (N. 44) and Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 107) derive it from the עו״י stem. This derivation is also suggested in the Talmud (loc. cit.).

[254] So also Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 28), Ibn Gabirol (*'Anaḳ* v. 137f.), Parḥon (*'Aruk, Grammatical Section* s. א). Barth § 49b, takes it as an Aramaic form of the Hif'il Infinitive, 'Af'el of דוש, but see Ges.-K. 344[i].

[255] The form לוֹט is, accordingly, a פָּעוּל form of לוּט, as construed by Ḥayyuj (N. 47), in which the Shureḳ was changed to Ḥolem under the effect of assonance. Some of the modern grammarians, however, take it as an active participle with *ā* obscured in Ḥolem, like קוֹסִים 2K 6:17, בּוֹסִים Zc 10:5, etc.

[256] Saadia apparently takes this form as Ḳal for וּתְפוֹצֹתִיכֶם (cf. *Kutub al-Lughah*, ed. Skoss, *JQR*. XXXIII, 3, 210); Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 49 and 199) construes it as Hif'il, with ת in place of ה, like תִּרְגַּלְתִּי Hos 11:3 for הִרְגַּלְתִּי (cf. above § 25e). So also Parḥon s. v. They consider it, then, as anomalous for וַהֲפִיצוֹתִיכֶם. Similarly Hitzig and Graf ad loc.; Ges. *Lgb*. 254; Olsh. § 213; and Koenig I, 471. Boettcher II, 33, *Rem*. and Muelau-Volk s. v. regard it with Ḳimḥi, as substantive. According to Ges.-K. § 91 l this is a forma mixta, combining the reading תְּפוּצוּ and הֲפִיצוֹתִיכֶם; while in the opinion of Ḥayyuj (*Noviye Materiali*, ed. Kokowzoff [text] 28) this form is composed of the plural of the noun תְּפוּצָה and of the Hif'il הֲפִיצוֹתִי.

[257] The form שֵׁרִיתִךָ is a noun for שְׁאֵרִיתְךָ, according to Ḳimḥi (*Shor*. s. v. שאר). But Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Menaḥem* 36), Ḥayyuj (N. 97) and Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 535) refer it to the stem שרה, in the sense of *loosen* or *release*, cf. וּמְשָׁרֵא Dn 5:12. So also some of the moderns, while others read with the Kethib שֵׁרוֹתִךָ, of the stem שרר, *I strengthen thee* (cf. *Ges.-Buhl* s. v. שרה). Ḳimḥi's etymology of this form is already found in the dictionary of David b. Abraham (cf. *Jāmi' āl-Alfāẓ*, ed. Skoss, II, 274).

[258] That the change of מוֹ to מוּ in יְכַסְיֻמוּ is due to assonance is sug-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

gested by Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 187), but see Luzzatto's objections quoted by Kirchheim (note ad loc.). Ibn Janaḥ's opinion is accepted by some of the modern grammarians (cf. Koenig I, 546).

[258a] Ḳimḥi, like the other medieval grammarians, does not make a clear distinction between adjectives and participles, and he regards both either as verbal or as nominal formations; cf. above § 15d, f, and below in the discussion of the nouns of the respective categories. That the participles with Ḥolem, cited here by Ḳimḥi, follow the analogy of verbs of the פָּעֹל type (=קָטֹן) is maintained also by some of the moderns (cf. Ges.-K. § 72p), although it is also possible to explain the Ḥolem as an obscuration of *aw* in *ḳawm>ḳāmim*, where the long *a* changed normally to ō according to the Hebrew method, and not to Ḳameṣ as in Aramaic, cf. above, notes 241 and 255.

[259] This is contrary to Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 76f.), who construes it as Pu'al of זור and distinctly rejects the opinion adopted here by Ḳimḥi. In his *Shor.* 177, Ḳimḥi attributes Ibn Janaḥ's etymology to Ḥayyuj, but the latter is clearly criticized by Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 75) for having omitted this example. Ḳimḥi's view is accepted by Ges., *Lgb.* 106, *Rem.* 2; Boettcher 910; Brock., *GvG.* I 507. Some of the modern grammarians refer it to the stem זרר and construe it as intransitive Ḳal, while others take it either as a passive Ḳal of זרה=זרר (cf. above, note 146), or as a Pu'al of the same stem; cf. Koenig I, 333f. and Ges.-K. § 67m.

[260] Ḥayyuj (*Noviye Materiali*, ed. Kokowzoff, p. 29 [text] construes it as Imperative in the sense of the Perfect, just as we may have the Imperfect and the Infinitive in the meaning of the Imperfect or the Imperative. He adduces analogous instances of interchange in tenses and moods, among which is also כִּי אִם בֹּא עֲתָּה עֲשֵׂה חֲזַק לַמִּלְחָמָה 2Chr 25:8 for כִּי אִם תָּבֹא אַתָּה תַּעֲשֶׂה וְתֶחֱזַק לַמִּלְחָמָה. In *Riḳ.* 110, Ibn Janaḥ takes it as Infinitive with Waw in place of Mem as plur. pronominal suffix, while in *Opusc.* 75 he also suggests the possibility of construing it as Pu'al on the analogy of זֹרוּ Is 1:6 (from זור), see preceding note. Modern grammarians (with the exception of Ges., loc. cit., who adopts Ḳimḥi's view) generally explain it as a scribal error for יָבֹאוּ, the Yod having dropped on account of concurrence with the Yod of the preceding word לְבִלְתִּי (cf. Koenig I, 645 and Ges.-K. § 72 *o*).

[261] The forms discussed in this paragraph have been puzzling both the ancient and the modern grammarians. Ḥayyuj (N. 42) observes the difficulty of the first two forms, but he offers no adequate explana-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

tion. He merely construes the first as second person masculine and the second as second person feminine. According to Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 65f. and *Riḳ.* 41f.) the ending תָה in תְּבֹואתָה is either a double feminine, as in יְשׁוּעָתָה, נִפְלְאָתָה, etc., in which the ת takes a vowel in order to prevent the concurrence of two vowel-less letters; or the ה may be regarded as an extraneous suffix to the cohortative form תָּבוֹאָה (cf. וְתָבוֹאָה Is 5:19), which, consequently, gave rise to the change of the first ה to ת. So also Ibn Ezra in his commentary ad loc. Joseph Ḳimḥi regards both תְּבֹואתָה and וַתְּבֹאתִי as formae mixtae, the first being composed either of תָּבֹא and בָּאת, or of תָּבֹא and אַתָּה; the second — either of וַתָּבֹאִי and בָּאת, or of וַתָּבֹאִי and אַתְּ (cf. Nestle, *ZAW.*, XIV, 319). Most of the modern grammarians explain these two forms as scribal errors for תָּבֹאנָה or תָּבֹאָה (having arisen through confusion with תְּבוּאַת in verse 14) and וַתָּבֹאִי (cf. Ges.-K. §§ 48d and 76h; Stade §§ 510h and 556d; and Koenig I, 646–648). More plausibly, the form וַתְּבֹאתִי is to be interpreted as another case of assimilation to the subsequent לִקְרָאתִי, cf. above § 36m (see Har-Zahav, *Leshon Dorenu* 84). With regard to תְּבוּאָתֶךָ, Ḳimḥi's etymology is generally accepted by modern grammarians (cf. Koenig I, 644), although the reading תְּבוּאָתֶךָ is also suggested (Ges.-K. § 48d). Ben Yehudah s. v. בוא, note 6, sees in these forms an attempt to introduce, in popular parlance, the inflexion of the strong verbs into the ע"ו, witness וְשָׁבַת Ez 46:17; cf. above, note 249, as well as examples of בָּאתָה (for בָּאָה) quoted from the Mishna by Albrecht, *Neuhebräische Grammatik*, p. 125.

[262] So previously Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 82) and subsequently Buxtorf (*Thes.* 214) and Frd. Delitzsch (commentary to Jb 135). Most of the modern grammarians, however, regard it as a scribal error for יְעַלְעֲלוּ or יְלַעְלְעוּ (cf. Koenig I, 299).

[263] This is after Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Saadia* 16) and Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 102 and *Shor.* 361). But this etymology was already suggested by David b. Abraham (*Jāmi' al-Alfāẓ*, ed. Skoss, II, 417). This form may also be a case of metathesis, according to an opinion quoted by Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 361), for the regular form יְרוֹעֲעוּ. The modern grammarians generally regard it as having arisen from the Pilpel (יְעַרְעֲרוּ), either through the loss of the ר, in consequence of which the ă was lengthened to ā, and then, by obscuration of the latter, to ō (Ewald 121b; Koenig I, 500; Ges.-K. § 72cc; etc.), or through contraction of the ר to ו (cf. Koenig, loc. cit.).

[264] This is the view held by Ḥayyuj (N. 54) and Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 70). The other opinion advanced by Ḳimḥi, both with regard to לוֹצְצִים

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

and בְּתְקוֹמְמֶיךָ; namely, that they are to be construed as participial forms with the מ omitted, is accepted by most of the modern grammarians (cf. Ges.-K. § 72cc and Koenig I, 454f.).

[265] So Ḥayyuj (N. 49) and Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 293). Modern grammarians refer this form to the stem נאץ (for יְנָאֵץ or יְנָאֵץ), or נצץ (for יָנֵץ); cf. Ges.-K. § 73g and Koenig I, 313 f.

[266] This opinion is quoted by Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 95f.) in the name of an anonymous contemporaneous grammarian, "whose scholarship is trustworthy", who postulates a Hif'al conjugation (cf. הָצַר, הָפַר). Later, however, he rejects the possibility of such a conjugation (ibid. 337f. and *Riḳ.* 40f.), although it might be borne out by the Arabic conjugation *'aḳtala* (IV) and by the Pathaḥ in Hebrew in the 1st and 2nd persons, הִקְטַלְתִּי, etc. Ḥayyuj (N. 50) merely regards the Dagesh in the ת as an exception to the regular הֵסִית or הֵסַת for the masculine and הֵסִיתָה or הֵסַתָּה for the feminine; but he also suggests a ע"ע stem סתת, on the analogy of הֵשַׁמּוּ Jr 10:25 (cf. Kokowzoff, *Noviye Materiali* [text] 11).

[267] So also most of the modern grammarians (cf. Ges.-K. § 72w and Koenig I, 460f.). Koenig sees in this form the influence of such formations as הֵמַתָּה.

[268] In his commentary ad loc. Ḳimḥi suggests that the idea of *dwelling* is implied by the Ḳere יָשׁוּב, thus taking it as a פ"י verb (=יָשַׁב) and the subsequent יְשִׁיבֵנִי as ע"ו in the sense of "if He return me to Jerusalem, where I may dwell". He thus regards the two successive verbs as derived from two different conjugations and stems. This does not seem plausible. More acceptable is Koenig's etymology (I, 468f.), who derives both from the פ"י and reads יָשַׁב יְשִׁיבֵנִי.

[269] Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 239) refers it to the ע"ע verbs, but he suggests also the possibility of deriving it from the ע"ו, with the second radical Waw assimilated to the ת. The latter view is held by Ewald § 114a; Olsh. § 223d; Boettcher II, 519; Stade § 413d; and Koenig I, 511. The former etymology is accepted by Ges. *Lgb.* 364; Roed. *Thes.*; Muelau-Volck s. v. Koenig traces this form to the influence of the sing. 1st and 2nd persons שַׁתִּי and שַׁתָּה, which seems the most plausible view.

[270] Cf. Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 37, 45, 48; also *Shor.* 531f.). Saadia already recognized this etymological principle in his treatment of the forms וַיִּמָּאֵס Jb 7:5, תְּמַלֵּא ibid 15:23 and יְגַמֶּא ibid 39:24 (see his translation and commentary ad loc.). It is also adopted by some of the modern grammarians, who trace it to the influence of Aramaic, where this consonantal compensation is common (cf. Koenig I, 323f., 358f., and

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

526f.). A Nun is often inserted also in other Semitic languages for the purpose of dissimilation to prevent the doubling or the sharpening of dentals, labials and palatals (cf. Brock., *Sem. Sprachw.*, 90).

[271] Similarly רֹמּוּ Jb 24:24 is regarded by Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 480) as Po'el. The same view is held by Parḥon s. vv. Ḳimḥi's opinion is, however, accepted by most of the modern grammarians (cf. Koenig I, 335f.).

[271a] The reason for the *separating vowel* inserted between the stem syllable and the afformatives in these instances, as well as in such forms as תְּסֻבֶּינָה is elaborately discussed by Wright, *Comp. Gram.* 229ff. This vowel evolved, according to him, under the analogical influence of corresponding forms in ל"י verbs, in order to facilitate the pronunciation of the contracted forms and to make the doubling audible. The ע"י forms נְקוּמוֹתִי, תְּקוּמֶינָה, and הֲקִימוֹתִי resulted from an assimilation to the ע"ע verbs; cf. Wright, ibid. 249 and 252. See also Ges.-K. § 67d and note, also Lambert § 976.

[272] Cf. Ḥayyuj (N. 119). Modern grammarians generally agree to take the instance in Nu 17:28 as 1st person plural, for תַּמְנוּ (cf. Wright, ibid., 229); while they differ in regard to those in La 3:22 and Ps 64:7. Some construe these as 1st person plural; others, after Ibn Janaḥ and Ḳimḥi (*Shor.* s. v.), as 3rd person plural (cf. Koenig I, 322f.). Cf. also above, note 270.

[273] Ḥayyuj (N. 103ff.) regards all these as Nif'al. Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 440 and *Opusc.* 198f.) rejects Ḥayyuj's view and prefers to take them as Ḳal. The etymology attributed by Ḳimḥi to his father is suggested also by Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* s. vv. נקב and נקר), but is condemned by Ibn Ezra (see Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc., p. 94 and notes 34 and 35). The latter prefers to regard them as Ḳal of the ע"ע over against "all the grammarians" (*Yesod Diḳduḳ* 23). Modern grammarians, likewise, construe them as Ḳal of the ע"ע (but see Boettcher II, 519 and 560) and trace these, as well as forms like נִחַלְתְּ Ez 22:16, וַיַּסֵּב Ex 13:18, וַיַּכְּתוּ Dt 1:44, הֻמְּכוּ Jb 24:24, etc. to the influence of the Aramaic method (for the Hebrew נִחַלְתְּ, וַיָּ ס ב, וַיַּכְּתוּ, הֻמַּכּוּ), according to which the first, instead of the second radical, is sharpened; with the pretonic vowel reduced to Shewa in some of these instances. So Margolis, *AJSL.*, XII, 213; also Wright, op. cit., 231ff.; but see Kautzsch, *Orient. Studien* II, 1906, 771–80 and Brockelmann's objections, *GvG.* I, 653f. See also above, note 253.

[274] Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 75) takes it as Perfect of ברא, with the change of the third radical א to ה, which is omitted in combination with the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

pronominal suffixes (cf. רְאָם). Ibn Ezra (commentary ad loc.) construes it as Perfect of ברה in the sense of בְּרוּ 1S 17:8. He mentions also the opinion of *Yesh 'Omrim*, according to whom the form is Infinitive Pi'el, like לְבָרֵר Dn 11:35, but he rejects it as impossible. According to Ges.-K. § 67p this is Infinitive of the פְּעַל formation, like לְרֹד Is 45:1 So also Bauer-Leander 430.

274a Modern grammarians generally refer the following three forms, with Barth (*Wurzeluntersuchungen*, 1902, p. 20 f.), to the לו״י verbs.

275 This is the opinion of Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 184f.) over against Ḥayyuj, who regards it as Hif'il (see ibid., 184, editor's note). It is taken as Ḳal by most of the modern grammarians. Boettcher II, 532, however, construes it with Buxtorf (Concord. s. v.) as Hif'il for בְּהָהִלּוֹ. The Ḥireḳ under the ה is explained by Barth (*ZDMG.*, XLIII, 178) as pointing to an Imperfect Ḳal with original *i* in the second radical (*yaḳtil*). But Pinsker (*Mabo* 154) sees in this form another example of interchange of Ḥireḳ and Ḳibbuṣ, the Ḥireḳ in this instance replacing the Ḳibbuṣ (for בְּהֻלּוֹ); cf. above, notes 16, 93, etc.

276 With regard to קָבָה, however, Ḥayyuj also advances the explanation given here by Ḳimḥi; namely, that the form is Imperative Ḳal for קָבָה, with Ḳameṣ in place of Ḳameṣ ḥatuf (N. 115). Modern grammarians contribute nothing plausible toward the elucidation of these forms (cf. Koenig I, 329–31 and Ges.-K. § 67o).

277 Both Ḥayyuj (N. 117) and Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 480) refer this form to רמם in the sense of רִמָּה (worm). So also Menaḥem s. v. רם and the modern grammarians (cf. Koenig I, 328 f. and Ges.-K. § 67n). Ḳimḥi's explanation, namely, that the Ḳibbuṣ is in place of Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf for the sake of differentiation, is accepted by Koenig (loc. cit.).

278 Cf. Ḥayyuj (N. 109) and Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 201). The latter construes this peculiarity on the principle of metathesis, the vowels of the preformative and of the first radical having interchanged. So also some of the moderns (cf. Olsh. 520). Others adduce, in explanation, the analogy of forms in which the vowel-less preformative of the laryngeal takes the vowel of the laryngeal, rendering the latter vowel-less, e. g. לַעְשֵׂר Dt 26:12 (for לְעַשֵּׂר), מַהְגִּים Is 8:19 (for מְהַגִּים); cf. Lambert § 95; also above, note 200.

279 Both these opinions are advanced by Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 498). The view that יְשָׁדְדֵם is anomalous for יְשָׁדֵּם is generally accepted by modern grammarians (cf. Ewald § 251c; Ges.-K. §§ 20b and 67cc; Koenig I, 356; etc.). The Ḳameṣ in all these instances is pronounced long by Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 197); cf. above, note 19.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[280] This form (רֹב) is taken in the participial sense also by Saadia in his commentary ad loc.

[280a] The occurrence of these three formations seems to be due, according to Wright, "to the resemblance of נָסַב to the ordinary Ḳal נָגַשׁ, whence the same variations that were admissible in the one come in course of time to be thought allowable in the other" (*Comp. Gr.* 232). Koenig I, 342 explains the formations with ō as due to the analogical influence of the ע״וי, on which principle are also to be explained the Imperfects in ō, see below 1.

[281] This type of Nif'al was first recognized by Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 186 f.). Ḥayyuj probably regards these forms as פ״ן verbs, since he does not record them in his treatises. Ibn Janaḥ's etymology is adopted by all the modern grammarians. Koenig I, 367f. sees in these forms the general tendency of the ח to virtual doubling, as well as to the influence of the Nif'al of the strong verbs, in which the original Pathaḥ under the Nun preformative is attenuated to Ḥireḳ. On נֵחַנְתְּ there is a wide difference of opinion both among the medieval and among the modern grammarians. Menaḥem 13a refers it to the stem חנה, for which he is taken severely to task by Dunash (*Tesh.* 64f.), who in turn derives it from חַן (חנן). Cf. also the controversy between the Disciples of Menaḥem (*Tesh. Talmide Menaḥem* 42) and the Disciples of Dunash (*Tesh. Talmide Dunash* 37) in this connection. Ḥayyuj rejects Menaḥem's etymology but offers no other explanation. Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 143f. and 186f.), on the other hand, admits the possibility of Menaḥem's etymology, but he prefers to construe it as Nif'al of חנן. So also the modern grammarians. Others, however, suggest on the basis of the translations, LXX, Vulgate, and Syriac, that it evolved from the Nif'al of אנח, thus נֶאֱנָחְתְּ>נֶאֱנַחְתְּ>נֶנְחַתְּ>נֵחַנְתְּ (by metathesis); cf. Koenig I, 368f. Ben Yehuda, s. v. חנן, note 2, takes this form as Pi'el of נחן (Arabic *nahm*) in the sense of אנח.

[282] So also David b. Abraham (*Jāmi' al-Alfāẓ*, ed. Skoss, II, 651). This is regarded as a "fantastic notion" ("willkürlicher Einfall") by Koenig I, 342f.; who construes it with Ḳimḥi and all the modern grammarians as Nif'al 1st person plural for נִשְׁדַּדְנוּ. This explanation is also found in Ḥayyuj (loc. cit.).

[283] Cf. Ḥayyuj (N. 116, 108, etc.). Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 198f.), however, construes all such forms of the ע״ע, which have no corresponding Perfect in the Nif'al, as Ḳal of the יִקְטַל formation, on the analogy of יֶחֱנַן Am 5:15. Modern grammarians are, likewise, divided in their opinions on these forms; cf. Koenig I, 336–8.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[284] Ḥayyuj (N. 55) refers these three forms to the ע״ו stem and construes them as Hithpa'el (see above § 37v), with the assimilation of the ת into the ר. So also most of the modern grammarians with regard to אֲרוֹמָם (cf. Koenig I, 454), while וַיֵּרֹמּוּ and הֵרֹמּוּ are taken by most of them as Nif'al of רום (ibid. 449f.). The assimilation of the ת of the Hithpa'el into ר is, however, unusual. It seems therefore more plausible to construe אֲרוֹמָם, with Eitan (*JQR.*, N. S., XII, 25ff.), as Nipo'el, or Nif'al of the Po'el conjugation (cf. above, notes 124, 125 and the following note).

[285] This is also suggested by Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 233) and is accepted by Ibn Ezra (commentary ad loc.). The modern grammarians take it, like Ḥayyuj, as Hithpa'el, with the assimilation of the characteristic ת into the שׁ; cf. Ges.-K. § 54c and Bauer-Leander 439. But the assimilation of the ת in this instance, as well as in אֲרוֹמָם, is unique. This form should therefore be regarded, likewise, as a Nipo'el formation (cf. preceding note). This is essentially the view held by Ibn Janaḥ, Ibn Ezra and Ḳimḥi. Cf. also Chomsky (*JQR.*, N. S., XXXVIII, 412–415.)

[286] So also Ibn Bal'am ad loc. and Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Galui* 72). More plausibly, this is to be explained with most of the modern grammarians as being in place of נֵאָרִים,* on the analogy of נִקְטָלִים, with the lengthening of the vowel under the preformative to compensate for the sharpening of the initial radical. Cf. above, notes 231 and 281; Ges.-K. § 67u; and Koenig I, 371.

[287] Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 188f.) includes the forms הֵחַל and לְהֵדֵק in the category of the Infinitives of Hif'il, which have the forms of the corresponding Perfect, like הִצִּיל and הִמְלִיט Is 31:5 (cf. above § 25j); while תֵּחַל can be taken, according to him, either as Imperfect Hif'il in place of תָּחֵל, or as Nif'al for תֵּחַל. According to Ibn Ezra (commentary ad loc.) the Ṣere in תֵּחַל and הֵחַל is intended to differentiate in sense between these forms and תָּחֵל or הֵחֵל (begin). In his *Shor.* (s. v. דקק) Ḳimḥi quotes Jacob ben El'azar (cf. above, note 83) as having taken לְהֵדֵק as Nif'al of דקק; but he rejects this opinion. Modern grammarians are at variance in respect to these forms. Thus Olsh. § 258b accepts Ḳimḥi's etymology of לְהֵדֵק; while Koenig I, 371, construes it with Jacob ben El'azar as Nif'al. Similarly תֵּחַל is regarded by some as Nif'al, by others as Hif'il (cf. Koenig I, 369f.). See also Wright, *Comp. Gr.* 233.

[288] So also Ibn Ezra in his commentary ad loc. and Parḥon (s. v.) Ḳimḥi's etymology is also mentioned by Ibn Janaḥ (lo. cit.), but is

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

rejected. Most of the modern grammarians read, after the LXX and Targum (תִּתְבָּרֵינָךְ), יְחִיתָךְ; but, according to Koenig I, 375, the reading of these translations may in itself be an emendation and is therefore unacceptable. He regards it, accordingly, with Boettcher II, 519 and Ges. *Lgb.* 369 as a formation on the analogy of the ע״ו. That יְחִיתַן is to be taken in the sense of יְחִיתְךָ is suggested also by Saadia (cf. Dunash, *Tesh. ag. Saadia*, 50) and is implied also in the Codex Babylonicus (see Pinsker, *Mabo* 119).

[289] So also Rashi and Ibn Ezra in their commentaries ad loc. Ibn Chiquitilla's explanation, quoted by Ibn Ezra, according to which these forms are to be referred to the פ״א stem (for נֶאֱשָׁים and יֶאֱשָׁים), is found in Ḥayyuj (N. 20). Most of the modern grammarians accept Ḳimḥi's etymology; cf. Koenig I, 353, and Ges.-K. § 67y.

[290] According to Ḥayyuj, interpreted by Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 232), the Dagesh in the ש of הַשַּׁמָּה is compensatory for the missing radical (common in Aramaic; cf. above, note 273); which Dagesh remains also with the pronominal suffixes, although in that case the compensatory Dagesh in the מ would be sufficient. So also Ges.-K. § 67y. This seems the most plausible explanation. For other explanations see Koenig I, 361f. As to the transposition of the vowels in בֹּקָה (for בָּקָה) see above, note 278.

[290a] Our text reads חָנְנֻנִי, but see Minḥat Shai ad loc. This was also the reading of Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 192), who furthermore reads the ח with Ga'ya. Hence the analogy of שְׁמָרֵנִי is quite tenable, and the form may plausibly be taken as Ḳal. This view is quoted by Ibn Janaḥ in the name of a contemporary grammarian. Ibn Janaḥ himself admits the plausibility of this view, but he, nevertheless, endeavors to justify Ḥayyuj's etymology, on the ground that the Ḳameṣ under the ח may be in place of Pathah, in order to compensate for the "lightening" (i. e. dropping of the Dagesh) of the Nun. In point of fact, however, Ḥayyuj seems to have read, like Ḳimḥi, Pathah under the ח, as may be inferred from the analogous example בְּהִתְחַנְנוֹ adduced by him.

[291] So in Ps 18:27. This peculiar form is similarly explained by Ḥayyuj (N. 103) and by Ewald § 132d. The latter adds assonance as reason for this peculiarity (נָבָר תִּתָּבָר). Various emendations are suggested by some of the modern grammarians, which do not seem probable (cf. Ben Yehuda s. v. ברר).

[292] The first three instances are thus, according to Ḳimḥi, Nif'al forms of the פָּעֵל formation (cf. above, j). Ḥayyuj (N. 103f.) likewise regards all the given examples (outside of וְהֻקַּכּוּ) as Nif'al forms; but

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the first three instances, he maintains, may also be referred to the פ״ן verbs, on the analogy of וְנִפְּלָה. Ibn Ezra (commentary to Gn 11:7) rejects both etymologies of Ḥayyuj with regard to these three instances and constures them as Hif'il. Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 106 and 217) follows Ḥayyuj in taking them as Nif'al. Similarly most of the modern grammarians construe וְנָסַבָּה and וְנָבְקָה as Nif'al, the peculiar formation being due to the false analogy of the פ״ן (cf. above, note 280a); but וְנָבְלָה is taken as Ḳal for וְנָבֹלָה; cf. Ges.-K. § 67dd and Koenig I, 325 and 343. The other examples are Aramaized formations of the Ḳal, see above, note 273.

[293] So according to Ḥayyuj (N. 101), but Ibn Ezra construes it as a mixed form, composed of the Hif'il and Pi'el (הִפְתֵּיתָ and פִּתִּיתָ). Modern grammarians contribute nothing to its explanation. It may, however, be a quasi-Hif'il formation of the Pi'el, which is common in Ethiopic; cf. Dillman-Bezold-Crighton, *Ethiopic Grammar* 150; also above, notes 125 and 166. See also Chomsky, *JQR.*, N. S., XXXVIII, 412 ff.

[294] See above § 7s.t and note 59, also *Opusc.* 298–300, where Ibn Janaḥ discusses, on the basis of quotations, Ḥayyuj's opinion on this relationship and interchange. See also David b. Abraham, *Jāmi' al-Alfāẓ*, ed. Skoss I, 19, 198, and 436.

[294a] But above, §18d (*Mikhlol*, ed. Lyk 16b), Ḳimḥi reads קְרָאן. This is another of several such inconsistencies in the *Mikhlol* (cf. above, note 232).

[295] This is considered by most of the modern grammarians as erroneous for קְרָאן; cf. Koenig I, 610. This error resulted, according to Koenig, from assimilation to the form עֲזֻבְתֶּן in the same sentence and in almost immediate proximity.

[295a] In point of fact, however, the participial form קֹטֶלֶת is a segolatized development of the more original קֹטַלְתְּ; cf. above, note 160. Hence מוֹצָאת is the more basic formation.

[296] This explanation is offered by Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 322 and *Riḳ.* 95) together with two others; namely, that it may be taken as Pi'el Infinitive, like נִאֵץ 2S 12:14, with suffixed ת, on the analogy of צִדְקָתֵךְ Ez 16:52, or as a noun with preformative Nun, like נְסִבָּה 2Chr 10:15, נֶעְכָּרֶת Pr 15:6 and the mishnic נִבְרֶכֶת B. Bath. II, 1. The latter etymology is the one he prefers. Some of the modern grammarians construe it, after Ewald § 240d, as Infinitive absolute of the Nif'al with fem. ending on the analogy of the ל״ה, but see Koenig's objections (I, 633). Koenig himself maintains with Olsh. that this is a fem. participial

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

form; but he is wrong in attempting to read this opinion into Ḳimḥi's words (ibid. 634). The analogy of מְלֹאת is not, as Koenig maintains, incidental, but is adduced by Ḳimḥi to prove that נְשֹׂאת is not a Nif'al participle but a noun of the פְּעֶלֶת formation, like אִגֶּרֶת (cf. Ibn Janaḥ, loc. cit.), which in the ל״א becomes מְלֹאת and נְשֹׂאת.

[297] So Hayyuj (N. 76), Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 93) and some of the modern grammarians; cf. Koenig I, 624. Koenig prefers to take it, either with Olsh., as Perfect, or, with Graf and Boettcher, as Infinitive, the correct reading being נֶחְבָּה.

[297a] The Ḳameṣ in the second radical, instead of Ṣere, is to be preferred in these paradigms; cf. an elaborate discussion on this point by Schneider, *Leshonenu* I, 175ff.

[298] This form was read with Pathaḥ under the א also by Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 40) and Ibn Chiquitilla (adnot. to Ḥayyuj, N. 76). Ḥayyuj (ibid.) is undecided whether this form is to be referred to the ל״א (for הֶחְבֵּיאָה) or to the ל״ה (for הֶחְבָּתָה). But Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit.) distinctly takes it as ל״א, with the long Ḥireḳ under the second radical dropped, as in the case of וַיַּדְבְּקוּ 1S 14:22 and וַיַּדְרְכוּ Jr 9:2. The form הֶחְבְּאַתָה evolved then, according to him, in either of the two ways: (1) An extraneous ה was affixed to הֶחְבְּאָה as in the case of נִפְלְאֲתָה, thereby effecting the change of the preceding ה to ת in order to avoid the concurrence of two vowel-letters. (2) הֶחְבְּאָה was changed to הֶחְבְּאַת, on the analogy of וּשְׁכֻרַת Is 51:21, נִפְלָאת Ps 118:23, etc. (but see above, note 105), with the consequence that the ת, being a consonantal letter, eventually came to be regarded as a radical, to which the ה was regularly affixed, as in סוּפָתָה, יְשׁוּעָתָה, etc.; cf. above, note 261. He also quotes the opinion of a contemporaneous authority (ibid., also *Opusc.* 95 and 337f.) explaining this form as a Hif'al conjugation; cf. above, note 266. Some of the modern grammarians prefer to see in these forms the analogical influence of the ל״ה verbs. Thus הֶחְבְּאַתָה and נִפְלְאֲתָה are, according to them, in place of הֶחְבָּתָה and נִפְלָתָה, with the retention of the א to preserve orthographically the kinship of these forms with the original stem; cf. above, note 121.

[299] Similarly in הַחֲטִי the Yod represents the third radical א. The change of the א to Yod is due to the phonetic kinship of this letter with Ḥireḳ, according to Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 306). The Yod in this instance is, accordingly, not Yod of Prolongation.

[300] This etymology is suggested by Ibn Ezra (commentary ad loc.) and is quoted also by Parḥon (s. v. נסה) in the name of *Yesh 'Omrim.* These grammarians may have based themselves on the translation

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

of the Targum (נִשָּׁא עֲלָנָא). This opinion is generally adopted by the modern grammarians; cf. Koenig I, 631.

[301] The theory that the third radical in the ל״ה verbs is really Yod (or Waw which passes into Yod), adopted by the modern grammarians, was advanced as early as the beginning of the 12th century by Moses Ibn Chiquitilla (cf. Bacher, *Hebr. Sprachwiss.* 60, and *Ibn Ezra* etc. 91f. and 153). Derenbourg (*Opusc.*, Introduction XX) attributes this theory to Samuel ha-Nagid. Both Ḥayyuj (N. 59) and Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 296), however, regard the ה as the original third radical. The fact of the matter is that the ה is employed merely to indicate, orthographically, the final vowel after the third radical had fallen away.

[301a] The final Ḳameṣ in the third person (גָּלָה, נִגְלָה, etc.) is a contraction of *ăă* (*gala(y)a*) after the third radical between the two short vowels had normally disappeared; cf. above, note 245. As to the reason for the Ḳameṣ, instead of Ḥolem, into which this contraction regularly evolves in Hebrew, see above, note 241, also below, note 514. The analogical influence of the ל״א verbs and the possibility of confusing the Perfect with the Infinitive, may also be responsible for the Ḳameṣ in the Perfect forms.

[302] The latter is the opinion of Ḥayyuj (N. 89) and is correct. This is, incidentally, the more original form, which is regularly employed in Aramaic and in Arabic, and is contracted from גָּלָוַת, etc. (cf. Wright, *Comp. Gr.* 257f. and Koenig I, 524f.). The fem. form גָּלְתָה, more common in Hebrew, arose under the influence of the predominating form קָטְלָה, the ת having come to be regarded as a radical; cf. above, note 298.

[303] The last two examples were construed as Infinitives also by Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 89) and Ibn Ezra ad loc. But even previously, David b. Abraham already recognized this type of Infinitive and adduced the instances of רְאֵה 2S 15:3, הָיֹה Ez 21:15, and עֲשֵׂה 2Chr 25:8; cf. *Kitāb Jāmi' al-Alfāẓ*. ed. Skoss, p. 583. On הָיֹה the opinions of the modern grammarians diverge. Some take it as Infinitive, others emend it to read יִהְיֶה or הֱיוֹת; cf. Koenig I, 600f. In Ges.-K. § 75n this form is pronounced "quite inexplicable", while it is distinctly construed as Infinitive by Bauer-Leander 423. Koenig I, 308, regards וּרְאֵה, as well as the preceding הַבֵּיט as Imperative.

[304] According to Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 89f.) these are not nouns but regular Infinitives. So also the modern grammarians (Ges.-K. § 45e; Ewald § 329; Koenig I, 166; etc.), who adduce in proof examples from Aramaic and Arabic. See also § 78 below.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

305 That the Waw in these instances is in place of ה was suggested also by David b. Abraham (*Jāmi' al-Alfāẓ*, ed. Skoss, I, 464). Ibn Janaḥ, however, basing himself on Ḥayyuj, tries to prove (*Opusc.* 304–7 and 334–5) that the Waw in all these instances is not Waw of Prolongation but represents a third radical. This is not borne out by analogous examples in Arabic. According to Wright (op. cit. 268) the Infinitive forms גְּלֹה, בְּנֹה, הֱיוֹ, עֲשֹׂה were originally the same "as the Arabic Infinitive خَفَاءٌ, بِنَاءٌ, بُكَاءٌ, where the third radical Waw or Yod appears as hamza. In Hebrew, however, the hamza fell away after the loss of the final vowels, and the preceding *ā* passed into *ō*. The other Infinitive גְּלוֹת, בְּנוֹת, עֲשׂוֹת, stands for *galāth*, *banāth*, by contraction, for *galawat*, *banayat*, just as in Arabic صَلَاةٌ stands for صَلَوَةٌ, حَيَاةٌ for حَيَوَةٌ, قَنَاةٌ for قَنَيَةٌ." The elision of the Waw and the Yod between two short vowels is common in Semitic languages; cf. Brock. *GvG* I, 57. See also below, note 514. Eitan (*AJSL.* XLV, 54ff.) endeavors to prove that the Infinitive-construct קְטוֹת is really a backward formation originating from this Infinitive with pronominal suffixes, in which a binding consonant was felt indispensable, although we find the isolated instance עֲשׂהוּ Ex 18:18. Thus the form קְטֹה or קְטוֹ (cf. רְאֹה Gn 48:11, עֲשׂוֹ ibid 31:28, etc.) are actually remnants of the Arabic form **ketoy* or **ketow*. He adduces analogous examples from Egyptian and the Semitic languages.

306 This is perhaps on the analogy of the Imperative forms in the Targum (אֵיכוּל, אֵימַר) and in Syriac; cf. Wright, op. cit. 280. But a Ṣere in place of Ḥatef Segol is not uncommon in Hebrew; cf. אֵזוֹר and אֵבוּס, for אֱזוֹר and אֱבוּס (see below, note 436), also וְאֵסָעֲרֵם Zc 7:14 for וָאֲסָעֲרֵם (see above, note 184).

306a Cf. above § 7t. This etymology is suggested by Ḥayyuj (N. 69). But the modern grammarians construe it as Hif'il Perfect, for הֶאְתָיו (<הֶאְתִּיו), cf. Ges.-K. § 76d.

306b In point of fact the Segol in these shortened (jussive) forms is merely an auxiliary vowel inserted, as in all Segolates, after the final consonant (second radical) had lost its vowel, since the pronunciation of two vowel-less consonants (יִקְןּ, יִקֶן) is generally impossible in Hebrew. As to the origin of the Segol in יִגְלֶה, it is probably to be traced to the ending *ay* (for *yaglay*); cf. Arabic *yarda* for *yarday* (see Wright, op. cit. 264). It would then be analogous in Hebrew to the forms שָׂדֶה>שָׂדַי and פֶּה>*פַּי, cf. below, note 561. The corresponding

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Imperfects, as well as the participial forms in the sing. masc., in the other conjugations, seem to follow uniformly the analogy of the Imperfect Ḳal, or they may represent in some instances contractions of *iy* (cf. Barth, *Nb.*, *Intr.* XXX ff., also § 136, note; Lambert, *Journ. Asiat.*, 1893, 285; Praetorius, *ZDMG.*, LV, 365.

[307] This is the etymology suggested by Ḥayyuj (N. 76) and Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 143). Both forms are thus Imperfect Ḳal of חדה in the sense of חדד. There is a wide difference of opinions among the modern grammarians in respect of these forms; cf. Koenig I, 373f. According to some they were taken by the Masoretes in the sense of *together*, but the translations of the Targum and the LXX (*sharpen*) militate against this etymology. Others suggest changes in the vocalization of either one or both of these forms, and they derive them variously from חדה or חדד. Kautzsch (*Orientalische Studien* 773) definitely rejects the idea of a secondary stem חדה alongside of חדד, and he reads יֻחַד (Hof'al) in 17a and יַחַד (Hif'il) with virtual doubling of the ח, in 17b. The etymology of the medieval grammarians seems, however, most plausible.

[307a] This is probably due to the influence of Aramaic where the final vowel in all conjugations in both the Imperfect and the Infinitive is Ṣere.

[307b] According to Eitan (*A Contribution to Biblical Lexicography* 8) וְנִשְׁתָּעָה is derived from שתע and does not belong in this category.

[308] So Ḥayyuj (N. 83f.) and Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 104). According to the latter the Ḥireḳ under the preformative changed to Segol in order to prevent the concurrence of two identical vowels. Ibn Janaḥ also suggests the possibility of taking the Yod as pleonastic, as in הַיֹּשְׁבִי Ps 108:3, הַהֹפְכִי ibid. 114:8, etc., with Ḥireḳ changed to Segol (cf. above, note 16) under the preformative to compensate for the missing third radical. Modern grammarians are divided in their opinions. Some construe it as Ḳal; others, after Ḳimḥi and Jacob b. El'azar, as Hif'il; cf. Koenig I, 568f.

[309] This opinion is mentioned by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 225), but is abandoned in favor of considering the Yod pleonastic, probably after Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Saadia* 51). So also Rashi ad loc. Most of the modern grammarians take it, with Ḳimḥi, as 3rd person fem. for וְתִזְנֶה; cf. Koenig I, 540. Koenig, however, hesitates to accept this opinion and prefers to construe it as 2nd person fem. with reference to the nation, whom the prophet, or a subsequent interpolator, suddenly turns to address (ibid. 541).

[310] So Ibn Ezra in his commentary ad loc. and most of the modern

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

grammarians (cf. Ges.-K. § 75aa and Koenig I, 554). But David b. Abraham takes it as plural of the Infinitive (cf. *Jāmi' al-Alfāẓ*, ed. Skoss, I, p. 543), see below § 78c and note 636.

311 So Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 111), who takes this word in the sense of *befitteth* Jr 10:7. So also Ibn Chiquitilla (adnot. to Ḥayyuj, N. 62). It is taken in the same sense also by Baethg. in commentary ad loc.

312 That this form is to be taken as Nif'al is suggested also by Ḥayyuj (*Noviye Materiali*, ed. Kokowzoff, Arabic text, 201). But Samuel ha-Nagid construes it as Ḳal, with Ṣere under the Taw in place of Pathaḥ (ibid. 171 in the Russian text). Among the moderns, Boettcher II, 415 and Ges.K. § 75y explain it as having arisen from a combination of Ḳal and Nif'al (תָּעֲלוּ and תֵּעָלוּ); but Koenig I, 553f. rejects this explanation and accepts Ḳimḥi's etymology.

313 So Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 125f.) and Ibn Chiquitilla (op. cit. 72), also some of the modern grammarians; others derive it from רחח; cf. Koenig I, 377.

314 Ḥayyuj (N. 71) and Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik.* 62) derive it from the ל"ה, probably after the Targum (וְיִתְחֲלֵי). Ibn Ezra (comment. ad loc.), however, construes it as Nif'al of the ע"ע, and he adds that "this is the opinion of all the grammarians of Spain" (ככה דעת כל מדקדקי ספרד). It is so construed also by the modern grammarians and lexicographers (cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v.).

315 Menaḥem 130 derives it from the stem ען. Ḥayyuj (N. 88), Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 353) and Parḥon s. v. refer it to the ל"ה verbs. The opinion held here by Ḳimḥi is also mentioned by Rashi ad loc., but is rejected on the ground that the Nun is not doubled. Modern grammarians accept Ḳimḥi's etymology and explain the loss of the Dagesh in the Nun as due to the lengthening of the preceding vowel, entailed by the pause (cf. Koenig I, 246, but also Ḳimḥi in his commentary ad loc.).

316 Both explanations are found in Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 152 and 154). Modern grammarians are equally undecided (cf. Ges.-K. § 67r and Koenig I, 341).

317 Both in the Lyk and in the Fürth editions of the *Mikhlol* the ה has Ḳameṣ. This is, however, most probably a textual error, for none of the medieval grammarians comment on this peculiarity, while Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 262) distinctly calls attention to the Dagesh in the ס, and Ibn Chiquitilla (op. cit. 74) compares it to כַּלּוּ Ex 5:13, remarking only on its peculiar accentuation. Its etymology is elaborately discussed by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 262–4), who prefers to regard הס as an

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

indeclinable word, not derived from any verb, but treated as such in the forms הַסּוּ and וַיַּהַס Nu 13:30. He adduces the analogy of the Arabic *sah* and *sahsaha* (*hush* and *hushed*). He considers, however, as probable the opinion of a "trustworthy" grammarian, who derives these forms from the ל״ה, taking וַיַּהַס as Ḳal on the analogy of וַיַּעַן, and both הַס and הַסּוּ as Pi'el (cf. Ibn Chiquitilla, op. cit.). Modern grammarians, likewise, treat הס as an onomatop. interjection, which suggested by its form the Imperative Pi'el of the ל״ה and was consequently inflected as a ל״ה verb (cf. Koenig II, 337 and Ges.-Buhl s. v.).

[318] Ḥayyuj (N. 61) reads דְּלִיו, which is the form "perhaps originally intended" (Ges.-K. § 75u); therefore Ḳal of the ל״ה. So also Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 80 and 137) and some of the modern grammarians (Ges.-Buhl s. v. דלה, Ben Yehuda s. v. דלי; Wright, op. cit. 259). In his *Shor*. s. v. Ḳimḥi calls attention to Ḥayyuj's reading, but maintains that in his manuscripts he found Pathaḥ under the ד, in support of which reading he adduces the testimony of Jacob b. El'azar. Buxtorf (*Thes*. 270), Ges. (*Lgb*. 431) and Olsh. § 247, take it with Ḳimḥi as Imperative Pi'el of the ל״ה. Others (cf. Koenig I, 332f.) refer this form to the ע״ע (for דֹּלּוּ) and regard the Yod as consonantal compensation for the doubling of the ל. This is also the view held by Ibn Ezra (comment. ad loc.), who compares it to בָּזְאוּ Is 18:2 (for בָּזְזוּ, cf. above § 38a).

[319] This form is so construed by Ibn Chiquitilla (op. cit. 82) and by the modern grammarians (cf. Koenig I, 545, and Ges.-K. § 27a), where various explanations of the change of the Pathaḥ to Segol are offered; cf. also above § 9h and note 68). Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc*. 80 and *Shor*. 214) and Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik*. 37), however, take it as Hif'il of כול (for אֲכִילֵךְ). According to Yalon, *Leshonenu* II, 118, note 13, this form is to be derived from אכל, in the sense of אש אוֹכְלָה Dt 4:24, etc. It is therefore to be construed as Ḳal Imperfect of the *yaktil* formation, with the א radical assimilated as in וָאֹבְדֵךְ, etc.; cf. above § 35c.

[320] Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 209) takes it as an instance of metathesis, for אֶרְוְיֵךְ, with the third radical Yod (in place of ה) distinct as in יִרְוְיֻן Ps 36:9 and יְכַסְיוּמוּ (in our text יְכַסְיֻמוּ) Ex 15:5; but he also suggests the possibility of the Yod being pleonastic, like that in לְדַרְיוֹשׁ Ezr 10:16 (consequently for אֲרַוֵּךְ). Koenig I, 590, likewise, explains it, after Boettcher, as a case of metathesis, which arose in order to avoid the concurrence of the two homorganic letters יך (ניכק) since the Waw and

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the Yod are easily interchangeable, e. g. קִים (from קוּם). Ḳimḥi's etymology is adopted by Buxtorf, op. cit. 270. Ges.-K. § 75dd reads with Margolis אַרֲוֶיךָ (for אָרוּךְ, like פְּרָאֶיךָ for פְּרָאֵךְ; cf. below, note 570).

[321] On הַקְצוֹת see above § 25j and note 158. מַהְרְבָה, for the Kethib מַהְרְבִית, is regarded by modern grammarians as a scribal error for מַהְרְבוֹת (cf. Koenig I, 537 and Ges.-K. § 75ff.).

[322] According to Ḥayyuj (N. 79) this form is either Hithpa'el of חרה, like תִּתְגָר, or is an apocopated Ḳal of the quadriliteral תחרה. Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 332) rejects the latter etymology and accepts the former. So also the modern grammarians; cf. Koenig I, 557.

[323] This etymology is not found in the original Arabic text of Ḥayyuj's works (ed. Jastrow, p. 162). It is therefore, probably, an interpolation by Ibn Chiquitilla. It is, in the main, the view held by most of the modern grammarians, although they differ widely as to the underlying form (יֶהְוֶה, יָהֳוָה, יֶהֱוָא, etc.; cf. Koenig I, 597f.). The final א in אָבוּא and הָלְכוּא Jos 10:24 is due, according to Joseph Ḳimḥi (op. cit. 4), to the analogy of the Arabic, in which language an א always follows the Waw pluralis. This opinion is quoted by Ibn Janaḥ from Ḥayyuj and is disproved (Addenda and Corrigenda attached to *Shor.* 586), on the ground that even in Arabic this א is merely a later scribal invention designed primarily to separate the Waw pluralis from the Waw conjunctive prefixed to the following word. Its use, however, Ibn Janaḥ maintains, was in the course of time extended to all other plural forms ending in Waw. The opinions of the modern grammarians in regard to these forms, likewise, diverge. Some see in them the influence of Arabic orthography, while most of the others regard the א as a scribal error; cf. Koenig I, 414f. and Ges.-K. § 23i.

[324] This possibility was already suggested by Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 141f. and 331f.) in connection with חַי Gn 5:5, וָחַיָּה Ex 1:16 and וָחַי Lv 18:5. But even Ḥayyuj (N. 77 and 108) refers the forms חַיִּים, חַיָּה, חַי and חַי to the ע״ע verbs. This is also the opinion of Samuel ha-Nagid (cf. Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. 92); but Ibn Ezra denies this possibility (ibid.). This difference of opinion prevails also among the modern grammarians (cf. Ges.-K. § 76i, Ges.-Buhl s. v. חיה and Koenig I, 595f.). The particular difficulty of these forms is due to the fact that the underlying stem is analogous in form to both the ל״ה (=ל״י) and the ע״ע verbs; it consequently shares the characteristic inflexions peculiar to both.

[324a] The same view is held by Koenig II, 42. Lambert § 1142 con-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

strues this instance as a contracted from of חָיִי, Perfect Optative, which came to be taken as a participle and employed in such forms as חֵי אֲנִי, חֵי ה׳, etc. As to וָחֵי Lv 25:36, it is in all likelihood a contracted form of וָחַי (cf. דַי, דֵי), see וָחַי in verse 35.

[324b] This view is also quoted in the adnot. to Ḥayyuj (N. 77) in the name of *Yesh Mefarshim*.

[325] So Ḥayyuj (N. 88) and Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 52 and 201). Some of the modern grammarians refer this form to the stem שיה and explain it as having originated from תֶּשִׁי, on the analogy of יְהִי from יֶהְיֶ (cf. above, e'), while others read here תֶּשׁ or תִּשֶּׁה (Ḳal of נשה); cf. Koenig I, 593f., Ges.-K. § 75s and Ges.-Buhl s. v. שיה.

[326] Ḥayyuj (N. 113) and the Rashbam ad loc. derive it from the stem נשׁשׁ. Ibn Chiquitilla (quoted by Ibn Ezra in comment. ad loc.) takes it as Pi'el of נשה (for נִשַּׁנִי). So also the modern grammarians, according to whom the Pathaḥ under the Nun is intended to emphasize the play on the name מְנַשֶּׁה (Koenig I, 572 and Ges.-K. § 52m).

[327] These forms are referred to the ל״ה also by Menaḥem s. v., Rashi ad loc., Ḥayyuj (N. 87) and Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 314). Koenig I, 572, accepts this etymology, while others suggest emendations (cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v. נצא).

[328] So Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 196) and most of the modern grammarians; cf. Koenig I, 579f. Samuel ha-Nagid, however takes it as a noun with suffix ־ָם (cf. נִין Jr 46:16), with the word נַשְׁמִיד omitted and implied before it; and he adduces analogous constructions from Arabic (see *Noviye Materiali*, ed. Kokowzoff [Russian text], p. 88).

[329] This is after Ḥayyuj (N. 80). Various attempts to explain this depression of *ō* to *u* have been made by modern grammarians (cf. Koenig I, 582 and Ges.-K. § 69t), but all agree in construing it as Nif'al participle. This vowel-depression is common in case of a Ḥolem which arose from an obscuring of *ā*, whose tone was shifted forward; cf. מָנוֹס—מְנוּסִי, מְנוּחָה—מְנֻחָתִי, קוֹם—תְקוּמָתִי; see also above, note 234.

[330] This is the opinion of Isaac b. Saul quoted by Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 333 and *Shor*. 189). Ḥayyuj (N. 80 and 110), however, construes this form as Perfect of ירד, on the analogy of סַבּוּ. So also most of the modern grammarians; cf. Koenig I, 428f. In quoting Ḳimḥi on this form, Koenig mentions only the explanations given by Ḳimḥi in his *Shor*. s. v. ירד, viz., those advanced by his father and by Ḥayyuj. The other opinion, that of Isaac b. Saul mentioned both in the *Mikhlol* (Lyck ed. 123b) and in his comment. ad loc. seems to have escaped Koenig's notice, since in quoting the same opinion from Boettcher as

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

that "held by some scholars," he remarks that he has not found anywhere a trace thereof ("wovon ich aber in den angeführten Werken keine Spur gefunden habe").

[331] This was already suggested by Ḥayyuj (N. 81) as a possibility and is accepted by Ibn Janaḥ (Introduction to *Riḳ*. XI). The form הגו (in place of הָגוֹ = הָגֹה) is explained by the latter on the principle of assonance, due to the preceding הרו. On another occasion Ḳimḥi construes both as Infinitive Ḳal, with Ḥolem in place of Ḳameṣ (*Shor*. s. v. הרה and in comment. ad loc.). This etymology was already mentioned by Ibn Chiqutilla in his adnot. to Ḥayyuj (loc. cit. and 74) and is adopted by Buxtorf in his Concordance. Boettcher § 353 likewise construes both as Infinitives of the Ḳal, with Ḳameṣ changed to Ḥolem in the initial syllable by assimilation to the vowel in the second syllable, particularly for the sake of emphasis (ibid. § 498c). Most of the modern grammarians, however, regard them as Infinitive absolute of Po'el (cf. Koenig I, 555); but Barth § 51a rejects this opinion and takes them as Infinitives abs. of the passive Ḳal (cf. above, note 146).

[332] So Ibn Chiquitilla (adnot. to Ḥayyuj, N. 80f.) and Ewald § 165b. According to the latter, the Dagesh in the Yod (in place of Waw) is intended to prevent it from quiescing in long *u*. Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 91), however, regards it as Infinitive of the הַקְּטָלוֹת formation, on the analogy of הַשְׁמָעוּת Ez 24:26, the original form being הוֹדְיוּת; but by metathesis the third radical Yod was transposed, as in כֶּשֶׂב and כֶּבֶשׂ, and the Waw assimilated into it, with the consequent change of the initial Ḥolem to Ḳibbuṣ. But he reads this word without Dagesh in the Yod, the Dagesh having dropped, according to him, for euphonic reasons. Some of the modern grammarians refer it to an intensive stem הֵיֵד, which originated from the ofttimes repeated Imper. הודו, the Infinitive of which is הֵיְדוּת, or by backward assimilation of the vowels הֻיְּדוּת (Ryssel ad loc., quoted by Koenig II, 204[4]). Olsh. § 220 emends it to read הודות. See also a plausible explanation of this form by Pinsker, *Liḳ*. 193, note 2.

[333] This opinion is mentioned by Ḥayyuj in the name of מִקְצָת סוֹפְרִים and is accepted by Buxtorf and most of the modern grammarians (cf. Koenig I, 526 and Ges.-K. § 75ii). Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 267), however, suggests that this be taken as a regular Hif'il, for הִמְסִייוּ, on the analogy of הִקְטִילוּ, which changed for euphonic reasons to הִמְסִיוּ.

[334] So Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc*. 155–7) and some of the modern grammarians; cf. Koenig I, 574f. But Ḥayyuj (*Noviye Materiali*, ed. Kokowzoff [Arabic text], p. 9) regards the Nun as pleonastic, like that in

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

אֶתְּקֶנְךָּ Jr 22:24 (cf. above, note 171), the form being Infinitive Pi'el (for כַּלּוֹתְךָ). This seems to have been the traditional opinion at the time, for it is quoted already by the Karaite lexicographer David ben Abraham s. v. נל (*Jami al-Alfaẓ*, ed. Skoss, p. 273), also by Ibn Bal'am and Ibn Chiquitilla (cf. *Mose Ibn Chiquitilla* by Poznanski, pp. 100 and 145). David ben Abraham also suggests deriving it, as well as מִנְלָם Jb 15:29, from נל = Arabic Nāla in the sense of *achieve*. On the possibility of interchanging ע"י and ל"ה verbs, see above, 218. Another explanation offered by him is that an א is elided here and that it stands for כְּנִלְאֹתְךָ, *when you get tired*; several instances of such elisions are given by him. Some of the moderns suggest emendation such as כְּכַלּוֹתְךָ or כְּהַמְלוֹתְךָ; cf. Koenig, loc. cit.

[335] Ibn Ezra (comment. ad Gn 29:2, also *Ṣ*. 53b) brings this opinion almost verbatim, but claims it as his own ("לְפִי דַעְתִּי"). In point of fact this etymology is not offered by Ḥayyuj, but is interpolated by Ibn Chiquitilla, for it is found neither in the Arabic original nor in Ibn Ezra's translation.

[336] Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 160f. and 171) records also the reading לְהַשּׁוֹת and construes it accordingly as Hif'il of נשה (=נשא). Ḳimḥi (*Shor.* s. v. נשא) also mentions this reading and etymology, but he rejects them (cf. also *Minhath Shai* ad loc.). The explanation of this form given here by Ḳimḥi is also mentioned by Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 171) and is accepted by modern grammarians (Koenig I, 570; Ges.-K. § 75qq; and others).

[337] This opinion is quoted from an unknown grammarian by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 53), but see above, note 237.

[338] Cf. Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 173f. and *Riḳ*. 80) and Parḥon 68b. This is accordingly a *hithḳattel* formation. So also the modern grammarians (Koenig I, 565; Ges.-K. § 75kk; and others).

[339] So Ibn Ezra (*Sefath Yether* 34). The prophet in his excited state of mind passes, according to Ḳimḥi, in his address to the people, from the third person to the second person, the latter being in the interrogative sense: ?הַהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתֶם (did you really bow). This transition in the use of persons is not uncommon in Hebrew (cf. below § 82). Koenig I, 566f. regards this explanation as possible, and he also considers "worthy of mention" that offered by Rashi, after the Talmud Yerushalmi (*Sukk*. 5:5) and the Targum Jonathan, viz., that this form is composed of מִשְׁתַּחֲוִים and מַשְׁחִיתִים. Most of the modern grammarians, however, regard it as a scribal error for מִשְׁתַּחֲוִים (cf. Ges. *Lgb*. 464, Ewald § 118d; Olsh. § 272b; Boettcher I, 404; Stade § 451; Ges.-K.

Digitized by Google   Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

§ 75qq). That this form is to be taken in the sense of מְשַׁסְּסוּים is suggested also by Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Saadia* 50) and by David b. Abraham, *Jāmi' al-Alfāẓ* I, 11, 238f., where the ת is taken as pleonastic.

340 Ḥayyuj (N. 97) and Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 525) merely record this form s. v. שסה, but do not explain it. Ibn Chiquitilla (adnot. to Ḥayyuj, loc. cit.) and Parḥon s. v. שסה describe it as an intensive form (פעל כבד), while Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Ziḳ.* 63) clearly and definitely construes it as a Po'el form. All of them, however, refer it to the stem שסה and regard the second ש as being in place of ס. So also David b. Abraham (*Jāmi' al-Alfāẓ*, ed. Skoss, II, 690). So also most of the modern grammarians (cf. Koenig I, 528 and Ges.-K. § 75z), but according to Ewald § 125a the form שׁוֹשָׁה arose from שׁוֹסֵס, just as רִצָּה Jb 20:10 originated from רצץ v. 19.

341 Menaḥem s. v. תא and Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Galui* 159) take the א as the original second radical, while according to Ḥayyuj (N. 98) the א is in place of Waw, the stem being תוה. Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 540) regards Ḥayyuj's opinion as "not remote", but he refers this form to תאה, and וְהִתְוִיתָ to תוה. There are accordingly two kindred stems having the same meaning. This is also the opinion of 'Ali b. Suleiman (Pinsker, *Liḳ.* 197) and of the moderns (Koenig I, 563 and Ges.-Buhl s. v. תאה; but see also Ges.-K. § 75bb, note). According to Pinsker (loc. cit., note 4) both תְּתָאוּ and וְהִתְוִיתָ, as well as וְהִתְאַוִּיתֶם Nu 34:6 (for וְהִתְאֵוִיתֶם, Hif'il of תאה, but wrongly vocalized because of false etymology), all have the same meaning and are to be traced back to the stem תאה, with occasional interpolation of the Waw, which is characteristic of the ל"ה verbs, whose second radical is a laryngeal; cf. שָׁחוָה, נָאוָה, הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה, etc. In וְ הִ תְ וִ י תָ, Pinsker maintains, the second radical is omitted as in נָוָה Jr 6:2 (for נָאוָה) and נָוָה ibid 13:17 and Jb 33:17 (for נָאוָה). Cf. also Ps 93:5, where נָאוָה (Perfect) is probably the correct reading.

342 That this form is to be derived from פאה and not, with Onkelos and Saadia ad loc., from אף, was already suggested by Menaḥem (*Maḥ.* 29b). So also Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Saadia* 57), Rashi ad loc., Ḥayyuj (N. 90), Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 393), and the modern grammarians; cf. Koenig I, 567f. The original Imperfect of the ל"י verbs (אַפְאִי) gave rise to this unusual form with the pronominal suffix (אַפְאֵיהֶם); cf. קְפָתֶיהָ (above, c), נוֹטֵיהֶם Is 42:5, etc. Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit.) explains this word either, on the analogy of the Arabic, as a denominative from פֵּאָה (I would scatter them to all sides); or like the Arabic *fayat* (I would cut and break them up); cf. Yahuda, *ZA.*, XVI, 271. The first etymology

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

of Ibn Janaḥ is found in David b. Abraham's *Jāmi' al-Alfāẓ*, ed. Skoss, II, 444.

343 This etymology is suggested by Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 150 and *Shor.* 470f.), probably after Saadia (cf. Dunash, op. cit. 18), and is generally accepted by the medieval and modern grammarians (cf. Ibn Ezra ad loc.; Parḥon 62; Koenig II, 111). Dunash, however, prefers to construe it as a participle of רדם in the sense of נרדם; but this etymology is rejected by Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*, loc. cit.).

344 Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 151f.) quotes also the opinion of some grammarians, who derive וָאֶכָּרֶהָ from the stem נכר (cf. Ibn Ezra, comment. ad loc.). He prefers, however, to take it as a ל״ה verb, with irregular Dagesh in the כ. So also the modern grammarians (Koenig I, 545 and Ges.-K. § 20h).

345 This opinion is quoted by Ḥayyuj (N. 93) and is rejected; but Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 168f.) defends it as probable, on the analogy of וַיִּתַּמּוּ and וַיִּדְּמוּ Jb 29:21 (for תַּמּוּ and יִדֹּמּוּ), but see above, note 273. He suggests, however, that it may also be taken as Ḳal with irregular Dagesh. Modern grammarians likewise regard it as Ḳal "with Dagesh forte *dirimens* to make the Shewa more audible" (Ges.-K. loc. cit.).

346 Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 36, 53, 55f. and 91f.) models the quadriliterals also after the paradigm פעל, but Ibn Ezra rejects this view and definitely construes them as independent paradigms (cf. *S. B.* 40b: והכל טעו ששקלו הפעלים הרביעיים על משקל פעל, also *Ṣ.* 9b). The fourth letter is, according to Ibn Janaḥ, merely the duplication of one of the radicals, generally the third, e. g. כִּרְסֵם = כִּרְסֵס, etc. He admits, however, the possibility of a quadriliteral conjugation (loc. cit. 80f.), in which the vowel-letter ה or any consonant may be added to the stem פעל. Samuel ha-Nagid (*Noviye Materiali*, ed. Kokowzoff [Arabic text], 212) draws the distinction between quadriliterals which sometime occur in triliteral form (e. g. אמלל Joel 1:10 etc. and אֻמְלָה Ez 16:30) and quadriliterals which never occur as triliterals (e. g. שַׁאֲנָן Jr 48:11, נַעֲמָנִים Is 17:10, רַעֲנָן, טִפְסְרַיִךְ Na 3:17, etc.). The latter are the only real and independent quadriliterals. In the case, however, of such forms as שַׁאֲנָן and רַעֲנָן, modern grammarians are in agreement with Ibn Janaḥ's idea, in regarding them as analogous formations to the Arabic *'iḳtalla* (conjugation IX); cf. Ges.-K. § 55d and Brock., *GvG.* I, 518. See also the following note and below, note 588. On analogies in other Semitic languages to the formations given below, which are really secondary forms of the Intensive conjugation, see Brock., ibid. I, 514–20.

347 This word is connected by Menaḥem 110b, on the authority of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

"some commentators", with כְּרֵשׂוֹ Jr 51:34, (see David b. Abraham, *Jāmi' al-Alfāẓ*, ed. Skoss, II, 131) and it is accordingly construed by R. Tam (*Tesh. Dunash ag. Menaḥem* 33) as composed of two words, viz., (יִכְּרֵם מָנָה = מִמְנָה). Dunash (loc. cit.), however, refers it to the stem כרסם, in the sense of the mishnic קִרְסְמוּהָ נְמָלִים Peah 2:7, with the כ and ק interchanged. So also previously Saadia (comment. ad loc.). It was Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Galui* 24), who with his usually keen philological sense, first perceived in the word the stem כסם (cf. כָּסַם יִכְסְמוּ Ez 44:20), with ר in place of doubling the second radical in the Pi'el, numerous instances of which are found in Hebrew and in other Semitic languages (cf. Brock., *GvG* I, 510). So also the modern grammarians, who refer to this category also the forms פרשז (for פִּרְשֵׁז = פִּשֵּׁז), מְכֻרְבָּל (for מְכֻבָּל), etc. (cf. Koenig I, 202 and Brock. loc. cit.).

[348] Menaḥem (loc. cit.) correctly connects this word with the Aramaic כַּרְבְּלָתְהוֹן וּלְבוּשֵׁיהוֹן Dn 3:21. So also David b. Abraham (*Jami' al-Alfāẓ*, ed. Skoss, II, 129). It is so construed also by the modern grammarians and lexicographers; cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v., etc. See also preceding notes.

[349] R. Nissim (commentary to Nedarim 41a) construes it as an instance of נוֹטָרִיקוֹן, for רָטֹב וּפָשׁ. Menaḥem 163, probably after the Targum (אִתְחֲלִישׁ) and Saadia, takes it, in accordance with the context, in the sense of רך (became soft). So also Ibn Ezra ad loc. Koenig I, 203, like R. Nissim, recognizes the kinship of this word with the stem רטב and explains the Ḥatef-Pathaḥ under the ט (רֻטֲפַשׁ for רֻטְפַשׁ) as due to the euphonic difficulty in the transition from the ט to the פ. Some of the modern grammarians regard it as a case of metathesis, for טֻרְפַשׁ, from the stem טרפש (=טפש); cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v. and O'Leary, *Comp. Gr.* 138. See also a plausible suggestion by Ṣiproni, *Leshonenu* I, 55.

[349a] Here again Ḳimḥi displays his progressive and dynamic approach to the study of grammar. In all cases where the Pu'al forms occur it is legitimate, according to him, to build a corresponding Pi'el, "for there is no Pu'al without Pi'el" (כי אין פועל מבלתי פִּעֵל, *Mikhlol*, ed. Lyk, 134a). See also Chomsky, *How Hebrew Grammar Began and Evolved*, *JQR.*, N. S., XXV, 3, p. 290.

[350] So Ḥayyuj (N. 79) and Ibn Ezra (*Moz.* 16a), but Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 80f. and *Shor.* 542) regards the ת as either expletive or pleonastic. Most of the modern grammarians take it as a Taf'el form (cf. Ewald § 122a; Koenig I, 557; Ges.-K. § 55h; etc.); but Barth, § 180a does not recognize the existence of such a conjugation in Hebrew, and he construes it as a denominative of a ת-noun, which corresponds to the Aramaic תַּחֲרוּתָא (contention, rivalry); cf. also above, note 150.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[351] This explanation is suggested by Ibn Ezra in his commentary ad loc., also ad Gn 8:11, but Ibn Janaḥ regards the ה as expletive (*Riḳ*. 80 and *Shor*. 530). Some of the modern grammarians take the ב of ברוחו as a case of dittography, due to the preceding ב in רהב (cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v.).

[352] Menaḥem 98, pursuant to his method, regards the Waw as extraneous; but according to Ḥayyuj (N. 80) the Waw represents the third radical. It is thus a Pi'lel conjugation. So also the modern grammarians (cf. Koenig I, 655 and Ges.-K. § 75kk).

[353] Of these verbs only שעשע is derived by Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 526) from the ל״ה; the others are declared by him to be of doubtful origin (*Opusc*. 241–3). Modern grammarians refer שגשג to the ע״ו (שוג), חעתע and שעשע to the ע״ע (תעע and שעע), while the stem of וְטֵאטֵאתִיהָ is still considered uncertain (cf. Ges.-Buhl s. vv.). On the latter see Rosh ha-Shanah 26b and Meg. 18a. Menaḥem 97 connects it with טיט (cf. also Ges.-Buhl s. vv. טאטא and טיט), but Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 185) regards this relationship as improbable.

[354] Ḥayyuj (N. 81) remarks on this form: "of the same stem (יפה) is יָפְיָפִיתָ, in which the פ and the Yod are repeated as in אֲדַמְדָּם and סְחַרְחַר". The second Yod is accordingly regarded by him as the third radical, in place of the ה, and the conjugation is פְּעַלְעַל, but then the correct reading should be יְפִיפִיתָ. According to Ibn Ezra ad loc., however, the first and the second radical are doubled in this instance for the purpose of intensification (cf. above, note 140). The etymology of Ibn Ezra and Ḳimḥi is also accepted by Buxtorf (*Thes*. 272) and by Ges. (*Lgb*. 73, 5), but is rejected by Ewald §§ 120a, 131g. Ewald denies the possibility of a *Ḳutḳatal* (פעפעל) conjugation and takes יָפְיָפִיתָ as a passive of יְפִיפִיתָ (of פעלעל), with the Ḳameṣ in the second Yod retained on account of its proximity to the tone. So also Muelau-Volck s. v. Koenig I, 584, construes it, after Boettcher, as a contraction of the noun יְפִי, or of a prefixed syllable suggestive of that noun, and of the verb יָפִיתָ, on the analogy of יְבֵשׁ תִּיבַשׁ, קֹדֶשׁ קֳדָשִׁים, etc. Others suggest the reading יְפִיפִיתָ, while Ges.-K. § 55e regards it as a scribal error (dittography) for יָפִיתָ.

[355] The forms מְכַרְכָּר and הַמְצַפְצְפִים are derived by the moderns from the ע״ע verbs; cf. Ges.-Buhl s. vv. See also above, note 140.

[356] The Pathaḥ in these instances is due to the influence of the laryngeal ר (cf. Ewald § 234e); or, in the case of וְקַרְקַר and מְקַרְקַר, to that of the semi-laryngeal ק (cf. Koenig I, 456).

[357] It is taken as passive of *Ḳetaltal* (קְטַלְטַל) also by most of the modern grammarians (cf. Koenig I, 248 f. and Ges.-K. op. cit.).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

CHAPTER FOUR. THE NOUN

A. IN GENERAL

§ 43. General View

a. The nouns are all referred by the earlier grammarians to a פעל stem, and they are divided into (a) *formae nudae*, that is, those that have no formative additions to the stem, either at the beginning or at the end; and *formae auctae*, i. e. those that have such additions. These formative additions consist of one or more of the letters האמנתיו.[358]

b. The nouns are further divided into three categories:[359] (a) deverbal nouns, i. e. such as are derived from verbs, e. g. רְאוּבֵן, שִׁמְעוֹן, etc.; (b) stem or verbal nouns, i. e. those which serve as a basis for verbal formations, e. g. חָכָם, רָשָׁע, צַדִּיק, חָרֵב, etc.; (c) primitive nouns, or those of which no verbal stem is extant, e. g. אִישׁ, אִשָּׁה, אֶבֶן, גָּמָל, etc.[360]

c. Semantically, nouns are divided into (a) abstract nouns, e. g. חָכְמָה, סִכְלוּת, רֶשַׁע, צֶדֶק, etc.; (b) concrete or adjectival nouns, e. g. חָכָם, רָשָׁע, מֶלֶךְ, עֶבֶד, etc.; (c) adjectives used substantively to indicate intensity or quality, e. g. אָדָם, זְכוּכִית, לְבָנָה, חַמָּה, etc.

§ 44. Gender and Number

a. The following peculiarities in the indications of gender and number are to be noted in Hebrew:

1. The same noun, whether masculine or feminine in form may be employed to denote either the masculine or

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the feminine of the respective species, e. g. גָּמָל (but in the Talmud גְּמַלָּה), שָׁפָן, חֲזִיר (in the Talmud also חֲזִירָה), אַרְנֶבֶת, צִפֹּר (also צִפֹּרֶת כְּרָמִים in the Talmud); in the plural גְּמַלִּים מֵינִיקוֹת Gn 32:16 and שְׁתַּיִם דֻּבִּים 2K 2:24.[a]

b. 2. Nouns of different stems are sometimes used to indicate difference in sex, e. g. אָדוֹן and גְּבִירָה or גְּבֶרֶת, עֶבֶד and שִׁפְחָה or אָמָה, חֲמוֹר and אָתוֹן, תַּיִשׁ (also תְּיָשָׁה in the Talmud) and עֵז, כֶּבֶשׂ and רָחֵל, etc.

c. 3. Nouns denoting names of species, particularly with reference to metals, are used in the singular form in the collective sense, e. g. נְחֹשֶׁת, בַּרְזֶל, etc., חֲמִשִּׁים כָּסֶף Dt 22:29, עֲשָׂרָה זָהָב Nu 7:14.[b] [362] In the case of עֵץ and אֶבֶן, however, the plural forms are employed because of the several varieties and kinds in which these species occur, whereas the metals differ in degree only and not in kind. Adjectives following the nouns serve to indicate these differences in degree, e. g. נְחֹשֶׁת קָלָל Ez 1:7, בַּרְזֶל עָשׁוֹת ibid 27:19, נְחֹשֶׁת מֻצְהָב Ezr 8:27, etc.

d. Rem. The singular of nouns which occur also in plural forms is sometime employed in the collective sense, שׁוֹר וַחֲמוֹר Gn 32:6, מֵאָה אִישׁ 2K 4:13, סוּס פַּרְעֹה Ex 14:23, אֶלֶף גֶּפֶן Is 7:23.

a. The use of the masculine (in most instances) or the feminine, to denote both genders, is probably due to the fact that the members of the opposite sex, for which there is no corresponding form, are regarded as subservient or inferior.[361]

b. In בְּדִילָיִךְ Is 1:25 and כַּסְפֵּיהֶם Gn 42:25, the plural is used because of the individualized connotation of these words, the reference in the former being to the wicked men and in the latter to the various types of money.[363] In mishnic Hebrew we find both the singular and the plural forms in the collective sense of nouns denoting metals or coins, e. g. שְׁתֵּי כֶסֶף Sheb. 6:1, אַרְבָּעָה כֶסֶף B. Meș. 4:3 and also נָפְלוּ לָהּ כְּסָפִים Keth. 8:3.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

§ 45. Structural Indications of Gender and Number in Nouns

a The feminine singular is indicated in Hebrew by the tone-bearing termination ָה or by ת (cf. above § 22a).[364] In the construct state the ָה changes to ַת,[365] e. g. שִׁפְחַת שָׂרַי Gn 16:8, etc. (in all cases of מְנָת and מִקְצָת a Ḳameṣ instead of Pathaḥ precedes the ת in the construct).[a] In a few instances, however, the ָה is left unchanged, e. g. סְאָה סֹלֶת 2K 7:16, כְּאֵיפָה שְׂעֹרִים Ru 2:17, טַלְטֵלָה גָּבֶר Is 22:17, אֲסֵפָה אַסִּיר ibid 24:22, חֵמָה אַפּוֹ ibid 42:25, וְעַנְוָה צֶדֶק Ps 45:5, עֶרְיָה־בֹשֶׁת Mi 1:11, אֲשֵׁרָה כָּל־עֵץ Dt 16:21, צֵדָה הָעָם Ju 7:8, מַחֲלָה לֵב Pr 13:12.[b] [367]

b. The plural termination of the masculine is ִים and of the feminine–וֹת.[368] In the construct state the ם of the masculine plural is rejected, and the Ḥireḳ is changed to Ṣere, e. g. דִּבְרֵי ה' Ex 4:28, etc.[369] (cf. also above § 22v). There are, however, examples of Constructs with no change in the plural ending, e. g. טוּרִים אָבֶן Ex 28:17, אֲמָרִים אֱמֶת Pr 22:21, סִיגִים כֶּסֶף Ez 22:18, אֵילִים צָמֶר 2K 3:4, שְׁנַיִם טוּרִים 2Chr 4:3, לְאַדִּירִים עָם Ju 5:13, בִּמְצִלְתַּיִם נְחשֶׁת 1Chr 15:19, etc.[c] [370]. On the other hand we find numerous instances of construct forms where Absolutes are expected,

a. Numerous examples of these forms occur also in the absolute state, e. g. רַבַּת Ps 65:10, 120:6, 123:4, 129:1.2 מַכַּת Is 14:6, חָכְמַת ibid 33:6, שִׁפְעַת 2K 9:17, שְׁנַת Ps 132:4 [in our text שְׁנָת], כְּשִׂמְחַת Is 9:2, פוּגַת La 2:18, and with Ḳameṣ before the ת, עֶזְרָת Ps 60:13, 108:13, תְּהִלָּת Jr 49:25, מִמָּחֳרָת Ex 18:13, נַחֲלָת Ps 16:6, etc.[366]

b. This form may also be construed as participle fem. Hif'il of חָלָה.

c. It is probable that the construct in these examples is implicit; thus, the words טוּרֵי, אִמְרֵי, סִיגֵי, אֵילֵי, שְׁנֵי, אַדִּירֵי, בִּמְצִלְתֵּי are understood before the respective genitives.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

e. g. מַשְׁכִּימֵי בַבֹּקֶר . . . מְאַחֲרֵי בַנֶּשֶׁף Is 5:11, אֹהֲבֵי לָנוּם ibid 56:10, קִנְצֵי לְמִלִּין Jb 18:2 (cf., however, below § 84 b); חַלּוֹנֵי 1K 6:4, אַנְשֵׁי מְחֻקֶּה Ez 23:14, מֵאַנְשֵׁי 1K 10:15, מֵי הַמָּרִים Nu 5:18, מַלְאֲכֵי רָעִים Ps 78:49.[371]

c. Other, less frequent, indications of the plural are the following terminations:

(a) ־ִי, e. g. הַשָּׁלִישִׁי 2S 23:8, צִידֹנִי Ez 32:30, לַכָּרִי 2K 11:4.19, עַמִּי 2S 22:44, La 3:14, Ps 144:2.[372]

d (b) ־ֵי or ־ָי, e. g., וַחֲשׂוּפַי Is 20:4, יָדַי Ez 13:9, וְשָׂרַי Ju 5:15, וְסוּרַי Jr 17:13,[a] חַלּוֹנָי ibid 22:14, גּוֹבָי Am 7:1 [in our text גּוֹבַי] חוֹרָי Is 19:9.[373]

e. (c) ־ִם (with the Yod orthographically omitted, which also occurs frequently in the flexions of the plural, e. g. דְּרָכֶךְ Ex 33: 13, Jos 1:8, Ps 119:37, חֲסָדֶךְ ibid 119:41 and מִצְוֹתֶךְ ibid 119:66 etc.), e. g. הַתַּנִּינִם Gn 1:21, נְשִׂיאִם ibid 25:16, צַדִּיקִם 2K 10:9, and in all cases of לְוִיִּם and גּוֹיִם.[373a]

f. (d) ־ִין[374], מְלָכִין Pr 31:3, חִטִּין Ez 4:9, הָרָצִין 2K 11:33, עִיִּין Mi 3:12, בְּחַיִּין Jb 24:22, אֲחֵרִין ibid 31:10, הָאִיִּין Ez 26:18, שׁוֹמֵמִין La 1:4, צִידֹנִין 1K 11:33, הַיָּמִין Dn 12:13, and in numerous instances of מִלִּין beside מִלִּים.

g. *Rem.* 1. The plural ending does not always express plurality; it is frequently employed to indicate excellence or majesty, e. g. אֲדֹנִים קָשֶׁה Is 19:4, and all the inflections of אָדוֹן, except first person sing., in order to distinguish it from אֲדֹנָי with reference to the Lord; בְּעָלָיו Ex 22:10,

a. The ending ־ַי in this instance may, however, be a pronominal suffix, first person, in the sense of *those that departed from me*, the reference being either to God, in Whose name the prophet speaks, or to himself and his teachings.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

בְּעָלַיִךְ עֹשַׂיִךְ Is 54:5, עֹשָׂי Jb 35:10, בְּעֹשָׂיו Ps 149:2, וְנוֹטֵיהֶם Is 42:5, etc.[375]

h. Rem. 2. The dual is denoted in Hebrew by the termination ־ַיִם[376] and is employed whenever one or more pairs are referred to, e. g. אַרְבַּע רַגְלַיִם, יָדַיִם, כְּנָפַיִם, שְׁנַיִם, שִׁבְעָה עֵינָיִם. The form כִּכְּרַיִם 2K 5:23 is the construct st. of כִּכָּרַיִם 2K 5:23 and suffers only partial change, namely, the loss of the Kameṣ in the second syllable, while the final ם is retained. Analogous to this are the flexions of שְׁנַיִם and שְׁתַּיִם, namely, שְׁנֵים עָשָׂר and שְׁתֵּים עֶשְׂרֵה.

i. Rem. 3. The plur. termination ־ִים is sometimes appended to nouns of the feminine gender, e. g. סְאָה (2K 7:1) — סְאִים (Gn 18:6), פִּנָּה — פִּנִּים (Zc 14:10), שִׁבֹּלֶת — שִׁבֳּלִים (Is 17:5), אֲלֻמָּה — אֲלֻמִּים (Gn 37:7), שָׁנָה — שָׁנִים, נְמָלָה — נְמָלִים, and also in verbal form מְקַטְּרִים Jr 44:19, with reference to women.[377]

j. Rem. 4. The feminine plural is indicated, in its flexions, by both feminine and masculine plural characteristics (וֹת and י),[378] e. g. שַׂעֲרוֹתַי, שַׂעֲרוֹתֶיךָ, etc.[a] In the construct state, however, the feminine termination (וֹת) alone is employed, e. g. מִשַּׂעֲרוֹת רֹאשִׁי Ps 40:13 (but מְרַאֲשֹׁתָיו 1S 26:12). There are also instances with both

a. There are, however, a few exceptional cases in which either the feminine or the masculine characteristics alone are used, e. g. מַכּוֹתְךָ Dt 28:59, מַכּוֹתָם Ps 64:8, אַחְיוֹתֵךְ Ez 16:52, אוֹצְרוֹתָם Is 30:6, לְדֹרֹתָם Ex 31:16, מִזִּבְחוֹתָם Hos 4:19, מִזְבְּחוֹתָם, מַצֵּבֹתָם Dt 12:3,[379] וְאַחוֹתַיִךְ Ez 16:55, זְנוּתֵיכֶם Nu 14:33, עֲצָתָיִךְ Is 47:13, תְּהִלָּתֶיךָ Ps 9:15, מִשִּׂנְאָתַיִךְ Ez 35:11 [in our text מִשִּׂנְאָתֶיךָ].[380] In the construct state, those with masculine pl. characteristics only retain their form, e. g. עַצְתַי, אַחוֹתַי, זְנוּתַי.[380a] Similarly, the construct of יְרֵכָתַיִם having both feminine and dual endings, is וּלְיַרְכְּתֵי Ex 26:22, and, on this analogy, שִׁבְעָתֵי from שִׁבְעָתַיִם.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

feminine plural and dual terminations, e. g. לוּחוֹתַיִם Ez 27:5 [in our text לֻחֹתָיִם], רִבּוֹתַיִם Ps 68:18.

k. *Rem*. 5. Some nouns occur in the plur. only, e. g. בְּחוּרִים, בְּתוּלִים, נְעוּרִים, זְקֻנִים, פָּנִים, רַחֲמִים, שָׁמַיִם[381], מַיִם, עֲלוּמִים. The nouns אַחֲרֵי and אַשְׁרֵי occur only in the plural. cstr. and with suffixes, never in the absl. state. The prepositions אֶל and עַל are inflected on the basis of the cstr. forms of the plur. אֱלֵי Jb 29:19 and עֲלֵי Nu 24:6, namely אֵלַי, עָלַי, etc.[382]

§ 46. The Noun With Pronominal Suffixes

a. The suffixes of the singular are: With nouns ending in a —

		Vowel	Consonant	
Sing.	1 c	ִי	ִי [a]	my
2	m.	ךָ	ְךָ [b] (pause) ֶךָ*	thy
	f.	ךְ	ֵךְ [c]	thy
3	m.	וֹ, הוּ	ֵהוּ, (הֹ) וֹ [d]	his
	f.	הָ	ֶהָ, ָהּ	her
Plur.	1 c	נוּ	ֵנוּ	our
2	m.	כֶם	ְכֶם	your
	f.	כֶן	ְכֶן [e]	your
3	m.	מוֹ, הֶם	ָם [f] (ֵמוֹ)	their (m.)
	f.	הֵן, הֶן	ָן [f]	their (f.)

b. a]. This is sometimes replaced by ֶנִי, e. g. תַּחְתֶּנִי 2S 22:37, בַּעֲדֶנִי Ps 139:11, בְּעוֹדֶנִּי Dt 31:27 (with euphonic Dagesh in the Nun).[383]

*See note 384a in Additions and Corrections.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

c. b]. The final ה which is usually latent reappears in several instances, e. g. בְּשִׁמְכָה Jr 29:25, יָדְכָה Ex 13:16, etc. The form מַלְאָכֵכֵה Na 2:14 is for מַלְאָכֵכָה.[384]

d. c]. Also ◌ֵכִי, e. g. עֲוֹנֵכִי Ps 103:2; this may, however, be a plural form in which the Yod after the Nun is latent, which is not uncommon.[385]

e. d]. Instances of ◌ֹה and ◌ֵהוּ (or ◌ֵיהוּ) are:[386] אָהֳלֹה Gn 9:2.21 עִוְרֹה Ez 12:14, כֻּלֹּה Jr 15:10, שֵׂיֵהוּ 1S 14:34, אוֹרֵהוּ Jb 25:3, מוֹטֵהוּ Na 1:13, וּפִילַגְשֵׁהוּ Ju 19:24, מִנֵּהוּ Ps 68:24,[387] יָדֵהוּ Ḥab 3:10 [in our text יָדֵיהוּ], רֵעֵהוּ Gn 38:12, and always with אָב and אָח [also פֶּה, e. g. אָבִיהוּ, אָחִיהוּ, פִּיהוּ, and by contraction: אָבִיו, אָחִיו, פִּיו].

f. e]. It also occurs with affixed ה, e. g. כְּזִמַּתְכֶנָה Ez 23:48 and in the plural כִּסְּתוֹתֵיכֶנָה ibid 13:20.[388]

g. f]. Sometimes הֶם and הֶן, e. g. בְּנֵיהֶם Ez 27:32, מִנְהֶם Jb 11:20, לְבַדְּהֶן Gn 21:28, פִּרְיהֶן Jr 29:28, מִלִּבְּהֶן Ez 13:17 וּמֵחֶלְבֵהֶן Gn 4:4 (this is probably a plural form with latent Yod after the Ṣere) and always with [אָב פֶּה and אָח]. A ה is affixed in לְבַדֶּנָה Gn 21:29, קִרְבֶּנָה ibid 41:21 (irreguarly with Segol before the Nun) [cf. above, note 232], כֻּלָּנָה ibid 42:36, and אוֹתָנָה Ex 35:26.

h. Suffixes with Plural Nouns

	Sing.		Plur.	
1 c	◌ַי, pause ◌ָי[a]	my	◌ֵינוּ	our
2 m.	◌ֶיךָ	thy	◌ֵיכֶם	your
2 f.	◌ַיִךְ, pause ◌ָיִךְ[b]	thy	◌ֵיכֶן	your
3 m.	◌ָיו, ◌ָיהוּ[c]	his	◌ֵיהֶם, ◌ֵימוֹ[e]	their (m.)
3 f.	◌ֶיהָ[d]	her	◌ֵיהֶן	their (f.)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

i. a]. On תַּחְתֵּנִי 2S 22:37 for תַּחְתַּי, see above, b.

j. b]. Also with affixed ־ִי (־ָיְכִי) Ps 103:3.5, 116:7.[389]

k. c]. The Yod is omitted orthographically in גִּבּוֹרָהוּ Na 2:4, [in our text גִּבּוֹרֵיהוּ] וּמַעֲלוֹתָהוּ Ez 43:17, וְעֵינָהוּ Jb 24:23, רֵעָהוּ ibid 42:10, מֵרֵעֵהוּ Pr 19:4, אַשְׁרָהוּ ibid 29:18; but it is retained in pronunciation after the Ṣere.[390] An Aramaic equivalent of this form is תַּגְמוּלוֹהִי Ps 116:12.

l. d]. It occurs also with א of Prolongation וְאַתִּיקֶהָא Ez 41:15 which is replaced by נָּה in תַּחְתֶּנָּה Gn 2:21 [cf. above, note 83].

m e]. Sometimes with affixed ה, e. g. גְוִיֹּתֵיהֶנָה Ez 1:11 and אֵלֵיהֶמָה ibid 40:16.[388]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOTES: CHAPTER FOUR, A

[358] Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 53) was the first to introduce the stem פעל as the model for all nouns, after the example of the Arabic grammarians (cf. Ibn Ezra, *Moz.* 22a). The letters which serve as formative additions in the nouns are given by Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit.) and Ibn Ezra (Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. 81, note 10) as אמתין, by Joseph Ḳimḥi as אמתינה. The Hebrew letters were generally divided by the Hebrew grammarians into *radical*, i. e. those employed only in root formations, and *servile* — those used only in the construction of words and grammatical forms. This division was probably first suggested by Ben Asher (*Diḳ.* 4), who distinguishes twelve letters "that are combined with all flesh" (מתלחמים עם כל בשר), i. e. which serve as formative elements to the body of the *radical* letters (but see Harkavy's objections, *Saadia* 37 and Bacher's comment, *Anf.* 25, n. 2). Saadia (cf. Dunash, *Tesh. ag. Saadia* 21 f.) takes Ben Asher to task for this division and accepts only eleven *servile* letters, offering as the mnemonic formulae טח ספר נזע צרק for the *radical* letters (*'Agron*, ed. Harkavy, 91) and בשלום כה איתן or האובים כשתלן for the *servile* letters (ibid. 57). The same division is adopted also by Saadia's younger contemporary, David b. Abraham (see *Jāmi' al-Alfāẓ*, ed. Skoss, Introduction, p. 11). Menaḥem 1 likewise adopts Saadia's division, but he introduces his own *voces memoralis* for the *servile* letters (שמלאכתו בינה). Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Menaḥem* 5b) speaks of thirteen *servile* and nine *radical* letters, the formulae being דותש הלוי אמת כטב (later, in *Tesh. ag. Saadia* 3, he changes it to אדוניה שלו כתם טוב) and חנ קץ ספר עז, respectively. In including the ד and the ט among the *servile* letters Dunash was probably misled by the forms הִזְדְּמִנְתּוּן Dn 2:9 and נִצְטַדָּק Gn 44:16, in which he wrongly construes these letters as *servile* (cf. Ibn Janaḥ's criticism in *Riḳ.* 11). Ibn Ezra (*Sefath Yether* 15) characterizes Dunash's arrangement as "contrary to all earlier and later grammarians." The succeeding grammarians generally accepted Saadia's division, but they exercized their wits on inventing all sorts of mnemonic formulae of their own (cf. Joseph Ḳimḥi, loc. cit. 2f.). On the meaning of these formulae of Saadia and of the later grammarians see Harkavy, *Saadia*, Add. 3, pp. 122–32; also Rosin, *JQR.*,

Digitized by Google · Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

O. S., VI, pp. 475–501; Allony in *Saadia Gaon*, ed. Fishman, Jerusalem, 1943, 270 ff.; and David b. Abraham, *Jāmi' al-Alfāẓ*, II, p. cxlvi.

359 The distinction between deverbal and primitive nouns was already made by Menaḥem and Dunash (cf. references in Bacher's *Anf.*, pp. 78, 85 and 106). A division of nouns similar to that of Ḳimḥi's is found in the anonymous Hebrew grammar, published by Poznanski, p. 3. On more elaborate divisions of nouns by the medieval Hebrew grammarians, particularly among those who were under the influence of Arabic grammar, see *Ibn Barūn*, ed. Kokowzoff, pp. 30–35 and note 58.

360 The notion that only proper nouns, like ראובן, שמעון, etc. are derived from verbs, while other nouns are independent in origin, is probably borrowed from Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.*, chapter 1). Modern grammarians, on the other hand, are inclined to trace back all nouns, with few exceptions, such as the names of the members of the body in men and beasts, to verbal stems (cf. Ges.-K. § 82). Both these tendencies are attacked by Luzzatto in his letter to Kirchheim, attached to *Riḳma*, where he maintains that some nouns can be traced back to verbs, just as some verbs are derived from nouns; while there are both verbs and nouns which originate either from instinctive sounds made under certain physical and mental conditions (interjections), or in imitation of external natural sounds (onomatopoeiae). Cf. Sayce, *Introduction to the Science of Language* I, chapter 1.; also O'Leary, *Comp. Gr.*, 107. Modern students of language are at variance with regard to the interjectional and onomatopoeic theories of the origin of language; cf. Bloomfield, *The Study of Language* pp. 74 f. and 81; Sapir, E., *Language*, pp. 4–6; also Pillsbury and Meader, *The Psychology of Language*, 284. See also in this connection Bauer-Leander § 60c.

361 Cf. Ibn Ezra (commentary to Lv 11:3): ודרך לשון הקדש להזכיר הזכר מכל מין כי הנקבה בכלל הזכר. In regard to the feminine forms like אַרְנֶבֶת, etc. Ibn Ezra favors the opinion of *Yesh 'Omrim* that the masculine of the species does not exist. As a matter of fact, however, these can be explained on the principle of *epicenes* in other languages, according to which the strong and courageous species of animals are denoted by masculine nouns, while the weak and timid are designated by feminine nouns (cf. Ges.-K. § 122e).

362 Ibn Chiquitilla is quoted by Ibn Ezra (*Moz.* 17b) to the effect that the names of metals are never employed in the plural. In refutation of this opinion Ibn Ezra offers the examples of כַּסְפֵּיהֶם and בְּדִילָיִךְ, but see below Ḳimḥi's explanation of these two forms and the subsequent note.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[363] Both in the Lyk and the Fürth editions the reading is הקבוץ לעניני הצרורות; but according to Pinsker in his letter to בַּעַל הַמַּגִּיד, attached to *Mikhlol*, ed. Lyk, p. VI, the correct reading is לעניני הַצּוּרוֹת, which makes better sense, referring to the various types or pieces of silver (cf. Ges.-K. § 124 l).

[364] More elaborate treatments of the indications and uses of gender are given by Ibn Barūn (ed. Kokowzoff), pp. 41–44 and by Ibn Ezra (cf. Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. 83f.). See also Ges.-K. § 80.

[365] According to modern grammarians the reverse is the case. The original termination of the feminine is ַת (<ָתָה), which corresponds to the regular feminine ending in other Semitic languages (*t* or *at* <*ata*). This ending ַת (*ath*), which is still retained in Hebrew in the construct state and before pronominal suffixes, as well as in a few other cases (cf. below), passed into ַהּ (*ah*) and finally, with the *h* dropped and with the vowel lengthened in the open syllable, into ָה. The feminine indication in this instance is therefore only the Ḳameṣ vowel, while the letter ה merely serves the purpose of preserving orthographically the Ḳameṣ vowel. On analogous examples in other languages see Wright, *Comp. Gr.* 132–4; Ges.- K. § 80m and note 2; also Sapir, E., *Language* 78f.

[366] The forms תְּהִלַּת and נַחֲלַת are regarded by Saadia as plurals on the analogy of the Aramaic (cf. Dunash, *Tesh. ag. Saadia*, note 89 also below, note 368). The modern grammarians read here תְּהִלָּתִי and נַחֲלָתִי, or נַחֲלָתָה (cf. Koenig II, 425; also Ges.-K. § 80g).

[367] On similar examples in the plural, where the forms remain unchanged in the construct state see below and note 370. Hitzig ad Hos 10:6 and Delitzsch ad Ps 45:5 construe these forms as instances of the "Nordhebräischer" status constructus with the termination ָה. But Koenig, *Syntax* 258f. and Ges.-K. § 131c–e see in most of these forms appositive rather than genitive relationships.

[368] The masculine plur. termination in the Semitic languages originated from the early case-endings of the singular (cf. below, note 372) plus mīmation, or nūnation as in Arabic, with the lengthening of the vowel-ending to convey the idea of indefinite number (cf. Wright, op. cit. 145). Thus the nominative ending in Arabic, *u* or *un*, and the genitive *i* or *in* gave rise in the plural to *ūna* and *īna* (in the oblique cases), with the final vowel added in order to prevent the long syllable from ending in a consonant (Wright, ibid.). In vulgar Arabic the plural termination *īn* is retained also for the nominative. The Hebrew preserved the ending *ū* or *ūn* only in verbal forms; namely, in the third

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

plur. Perfect and in the second and third plur. Imperfect (cf. above §§ 19b and 22i), while in the nouns and the genitive ending *īm* prevailed (but also *īn* and *ī*, see below). In ancient Hebrew, as exemplified in the Ras Shamra texts, the plur. m. ends in *ūma* (nom.), *īma* (gen.-acc.), cf. Cyrus Gordon's *Ugaritic Grammar*, 38. Cf. analogies in other Semitic languages quoted by Ges.-K. § 87d. The fem. plur. termination is likewise to be traced back to the sing. fem. *ăth* (cf. above 365), which was lengthened to *āth*, and in accordance with the principle of vowel-changes, to ָת in Aramaic (cf. above, note 366) and to וֹת– in Hebrew (cf. Wright, *Comp. Gr.*, loc. cit. 147f.; Brock. *GvG.* I, 441; but also Ges.-K. § 87 l and Lambert § 188). In the Hebrew of Ras Shamra the plur. ending still is *ātu* (nom.), *āti* (gen.-acc.), cf. Gordon, l. c.

[369] The ending ֵי in the construct state is rather peculiar. Wright (op. cit. 151) regards it as a contraction of the dual ַי, which supplanted the forms of the plural, as witness the forms יְדֵי = דְּבָרַי and יָדָיו = דְּבָרָיו. So also Olsh. § 16b and Noeldeke (*Beitr.* 48 ff.) Others, however, take it as an abstract collective termination, as in אִשָּׁה and חוֹרָי Is 19:9, effected under the influence of the ל״י verbs (Philippi, *ThLZ.*, 1890, col 419; Barth *ZDMG.*, 1904, 431 ff.). According to Praetorius (*ZDMG.*, 56, 686 f.) this construct form is to be traced back to an original plur. abs. in ֵי, which is still extant in Syriac (*e'*) and in Arabic (*ay*) but disappears in Aramaic and in Hebrew (but see below, note 371). This ending, he maintains, was originally an abstract fem. sing. and was later extended to indicate plural forms (but see Barth, op. cit.).

[370] Cf. Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 129) and Ibn Ezra (Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. 118), but according to modern grammarians the relationship in these instances is appositive and not genitive (cf. Ges.-K. § 131b–e).

[371] Cf. Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 133f. and 160). These forms may, however, be taken as remains of the original plural absolutes to which Praetorius traces the constructs (cf. above, note 369), but which he, as well as Barth (op. cit.), assumes to have disappeared in Hebrew. This termination *ē* is a contraction of the diphthong *ay* and is caused by the loss (or weakening) of the accent, which process is a common phenomenon in the Semitic languages (cf. O' Leary, *Comp. Gr.* 113f. and 193). This will perhaps also explain the plurals with the pronominal suffixes, thus דְּבָרַי+ִי=דְּבָרַי, דְּבָרַי+הוּ=דְּבָרָיו (cf. Wright, op. cit. 72f. and 151, also Ges. K. § 91i, note 1), etc., with the diphthong *ay* regained by the recovery of the tone. Wright, however, sees in these plurals with the suffixes further corroboration of his supposition that the dual forms

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

displaced the plural in the inflexions (cf. above, note 369; also below, note 662).

[372] Cf. the masoretic note on Ps 144:2 and *Riḳma* 169. This *i*-ending is commonly added to the plurals of every formation before suffixes in Ethiopic and is another monophthong into which the diphthong *ay* frequently contracts (see O' Leary, op. cit.). This may be regarded as the basis of the plural endings ִ־ים and ִ־ין in Hebrew, but see above, note 368.

[373] These may be regular uncontracted plurals with the diphthongal ending ַ־י (cf. above, note 369), but גּוֹבָי and חוֹרָי are probably rather to be construed as collective nouns with ַ־י termination (cf. Barth *Nb* 379 and Ges.-K. §§ 86i and 87g). Pinsker (*Mabo* 133, note 2) and Luzzatto ad loc. read חֲוָרו in place of חוֹרָי to correspond with ובשו at the beginning of the verse.

[373a] As a rule, there is a tendency in our masoretic text to employ the scriptio defectiva in order to avoid the scriptio plene in two successive syllables, or wherever the letter which should be employed as a vowel-letter immediately precedes as a consonant. This explains the defective writing in the last five examples.

[374] This is the regular plural form in Aramaic and in the Mesha' inscription.

[375] Cf. Ibn Ezra (*Moz.* 19ab), but in the instances of the לו״י stem the Yod need not necessarily be construed as indicating the plural. It may simply be traced to the singular ending ַ־י, which contracts before suffixes beginning with a consonant into a monophthong (cf. below, note 570).

[376] This ending evolved, according to Wright (op. cit. 149f.), on the same principle as in the plural (cf. above, note 368) from the genitive ending *i* with the heightening (instead of lengthening as in the plural) of the singular termination by the insertion of a short *ă*. The characteristic of the dual is thus *ay* (or modifications thereof) in all the Semitic languages, with mīmation in Hebrew and nūnation in Aramaic and Arabic (also in Hebrew: דֹּתָיְנָה, דֹּתָיִן Gn 37:17a, which is contracted into דֹּתָן ibid b; also קַרְתָּן Jos 21:32, cf. קִרְיָתַיִם 1Chr 6:61); cf. O' Leary, op. cit. 194f; also above, note 50. The ending ַ־יִם is therefore for ַ־יְם, with supplemental or auxiliary vowel under the Yod. In Hebrew the use of the dual is confined to nouns and numerals only; in other Semitic languages, also in Sanscrit and Greek, its use is more widely extended, but it tends to decay in modern languages and dialects (cf. Ges.-K. § 88g).

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[377] There are, on the other hand, numerous instances of masculine nouns with the ending וֹת–. For a fuller discussion and list of examples see Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. 85 and Ges.-K. § 87pf. On the same phenomenon in other Semitic languages see Brock. *Sem. Sprachw.* 110.

[378] The Yod in these suffixes is probably due to the influence of the masc. plur. suffixes, in which the Yod represents the ending of the construct state (ֵי–) of the masc. plur. (cf. Ges.-K. § 91m); but see above, notes 369 and 371.

[379] In Arabic and in Syriac the sing. suffixes are regularly added to the fem. plur. endings (cf. Wright, op. cit. 160). So also in Biblical Aramaic, e. g. אֲבָהָתִי Dn 2:23, אֲבָהָתָךְ Ezra 4:15, etc. This must have been the original form also in Hebrew, which was subsequently supplanted by the longer form with Yod (cf. Ges.-K. § 91n).

[380] Cf. Ibn Ezra (comment., Dt 28:59): ל׳ יחיד עם רבים מורכבת וכן עֵדֹתָי זו אלמדם. In the last three instances, however, as well as in בְּאַשְׁמָתֵינוּ Ezr. 9:15, the Ḳameṣ before the pronominal suffix may be traced to the influence of the plur. characteristic ָת– in Aramaic (cf. above, notes 366 and 368).

[380a] These are purely hypothetical forms; they do not occur in the Bible. Ḳimḥi constructs these forms probably on the analogy of מְרַאֲשׁוֹתָי.

[381] Ḳimḥi thus follows Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 172) in regarding מַיִם and שָׁמַיִם as plur. forms and not, with Ibn Ezra (*Yesod Mispar*, attached to Pinsker's *Mabo*, 139 f.), as duals. Efodi (*Ma'ase Efod* 153f.) accepts Ibn Ezra's opinion, while modern grammarians construe them as plurals for מַיִּים and שָׁמַיִּים (sing. מַי and שָׁמַי), which were contracted into מַיִם and שָׁמַיִם, and subsequently with the helping vowel under the Yod, passed into מַיִם and שָׁמַיִם. Analogous formations are found in Arabic and Aramaic (cf. Wright, op. cit., 150f. and Ges.-K. § 88d). Cf. also below, note 589.

[382] On the inflexions of the prepositions see below § 74d. The Yod in these prepositions is really a third radical and not a plur. characteristic; cf. below, note 614.

[383] Cf. Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 112) and Ges.-K. § 103d, note 1. According to Brockelmann (*ZA*., XIV, 347f.) תַּחְתֶּנִי and בַּעֲדֶנִי were modelled after מִמֶּנִּי, when its origin from reduplication (cf. below, note 619) had been forgotten; while the formations עוֹדֶנִי, אֵינֶנִּי (cf. below § 72), etc. may be traces of the lost Hebrew equivalent of the Arabic *'anna* (*that*), *'anni* (*that I*), etc.

[384] According to Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 40 and 46) and Ibn Ezra (comment.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ad loc.) the ה in this instance is in place of the Yod found in forms like עֲוֹנֵכִי Ps 103:3, etc. The form intended is therefore מַלְאָכֵכִי. But Stade § 356 and Koenig II, 571, note 1, construe it as a case of dittography, due to the ה in הוי of the following verse and is to be read מַלְאָכֵךְ or מַלְאָכַיִךְ.

385 The ending כִי (=כִּי) is the original suffix for the second person fem. and is still retained in Arabic, Aramaic and, orthographically, in Syriac (Wright, op. cit. 154f.). The Ṣere preceding the suffix is regarded by Wright as tone-lengthened of the old genitive termination *i*. So also Brock. *GvG*. I, 478. But it may also be traced back to the analogical influence of the plur. *aiki*, cf. the subsequent note.

386 The suffixes in Ḥolem are to be traced back, according to Wright (loc. cit.), to the old accusative edning *ă* [*malka*+(*h*)*u*=(ה׳) מַלְכּוֹ,] while those in ֵהוּ and ֵיהוּ are derived from the ancient genitive (*malki*+*hu*). The parallel of the latter is the Aramaic ֵהּ. But the analogical influence of the original plural suffix *aihu* (cf. above, note 371) may also be evident here, see preceding note. Barth (*AJSL*, XVII, 199f.) sees here the influence of the ל״ה nouns ending in ֶה cf. שָׂדֶה — שָׂדֵהוּ).

387 But below § 74e Ḳimḥi distinctly reads this form with Segol under the Nun. So also Ibn Ezra (comment. ad loc.). This reading is also adopted by Baer. Ibn Ezra (ibid.) mentions the opinion of those who take it as Pi'el, like צִוָּהוּ, with Segol in place of Ḳameṣ; but he rejects it. Some of the moderns regard it as a substantive (מָן *portion*, cf. Ges.-K. § 103m).

388 These forms, as well as those with suffixes for the third person sing. ֶנָּה, ֵנָּה, הֵן; and the plurals ֵיהֶמָה and ֵיהֶנָה (cf. below, h and m) are respectively fuller and more original types. Cf. on this subject the elaborate discussion by Barth (op. cit. 193ff.).

389 This is the fuller and earlier form which is still retained in Arabic and, orthographically, also in Syriac (cf. Wright, op. cit. 158).

390 Ibn Chiquitilla (quoted by Ibn Ezra ad Na 2:4 and S. 20a; cf. also Poznanski, *Ibn Chiquitilla*, pp. 104 and 118) construes גְּבוֹרֵהוּ and רֵעֵהוּ Jb 42:16 as plurals, but Ibn Ezra (loc. cit.) objects to this etymology and takes all instances with the suffix ֵהוּ as singulars. Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 112) reads גִּבּוֹרֵיהוּ, with Yod after the ר, and regards it, as well as מַעֲלוֹתֵהוּ, as plural. Ḳimḥi's etymology with regard to all the examples given here is probably correct. These endings are very likely the fuller and original for ָיהוּ, which later contracted into ָיו (cf. Wright, loc. cit.).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

B. MASCULINE NOUNS

§ 47. Simple Formations

I. PARADIGMS OF MASCULINE NOUNS

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Sing. absolute	[a] דָּבָר (word)	חָכָם (wise)	[e] זָקֵן (old man)	כָּתֵף (shoulder)	חָצֵר (court)	[k] בְּאֵר [gg] כְּתָב (writing) (well)
Sing. construct	[b] דְּבַר	חֲכַם	[f] זְקַן	[g] גֵּזֶל כֶּתֶף	חֲצַר	[h] כְּתָב
Sing. with light suff.	דְּבָרִי דְּבָרְךָ	חֲכָמִי חֲכָמְךָ	זְקֵנִי [יְרֵחֵךְ] זְקֵנְךָ Is 60:20	כְּתֵפִי	חֲצֵרִי	[i] כְּתָבִי כְּתָבְךָ
Sing. with grave suff.	דְּבַרְכֶם	חֲכַמְכֶם	זְקַנְכֶם			כְּתַבְכֶם
Plur. absolute	דְּבָרִים	חֲכָמִים	גְּדֵרוֹת, זְקֵנִים		חֲצֵרִים חֲצֵרוֹת	כְּתָבִים
Plur. construct	[c] דִּבְרֵי	חַכְמֵי	גִּדְרוֹת, זִקְנֵי		חַצְרֵי חַצְרוֹת	[j][400] כִּתְבֵי
Plur. with light suff.	דְּבָרַי	חֲכָמַי	גְּדֵרוֹתַי, זְקֵנַי		חֲצֵרַי חֲצֵרוֹתַי	
Plur. with grave suff.	דִּבְרֵיכֶם	חַכְמֵיכֶם	זִקְנֵיכֶם		חַצְרֵיכֶם	
Dual absolute	[d] כְּנָפַיִם	חֲלָצַיִם	יְרֵכַיִם			
Dual construct	כַּנְפֵי					

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

a. a]. On the same analogy are inflected the forms פֵּעָל, e. g. שֵׂעָר, נֵכָר, etc.

b. b]. It occurs also with Ṣere under the second radical, e. g. חֲלֵב Is 60:16, הֲבֵל Ec 1:2,[a] and, with Ṣere changed to Segol on account of the Maḳḳef following it, וּלְבֶן Gn 49:12. In נֵכַר Dt 31:16 and צֵלַע Jos 18:28, the Ṣere in the first syllable is retained, while the Ḳameṣ is changed to Pathaḥ.[b] The forms וְשֵׂעַר Is 7:20 and שַׂעְרֵךְ Cn 6:5 are to be referred to a different category of nouns.[392]

c. c]. Also with Pathaḥ in the first syllable, e. g. [חַכְמֵי], עַנְבֵי. The Dagesh in the Nun of עִנְּבֵי Lev 25:5 and Dt 32:32 is euphonic [Cf. above § 16a and note 84].

d. d]. Also דְּלָתַיִם Dt 3:5 and דְּרָכַיִם Pr 28:6 may probably be referred to the forms דֶּלֶת and דֶּרֶךְ.[393]

e. *Rem.* 1. In the flexions of גָּמָל, שָׁפָן and קָטָן, the Ḳameṣ in the second syllable is changed to Pathaḥ followed by Dagesh in the final radical, e. g. קְטַנִּים, גְּמַלִּים, שְׁפַנִּים.[394] This form is retained throughout all the inflexions, e. g. גְּמַלֵּיהֶם, גְּמַלַּי, etc.

f. *Rem.* 2. Instances of this formation with Pathaḥ in the second syllable also occur, e. g. פָּרַשׁ Ez 26:10,[395] פָּרַס ibid 38:5, אָשַׁף Dn 2:10 [in our text אַשָּׁף], and in pause שָׁשַׁר Jr 22:14 and Ez 23:14.

g. *Rem.* 3. In הֵיכָל the Ṣere is retained in all its inflections, on account of the Yod following it. The nouns

a. Some grammarians, however, regard it as construct of הֶבֶל, like חֲדַר Ex 7:28 from חֶדֶר, and thus admit the possibility of two forms in the construct of פֵּעָל.[391]

b. In the former instance the genitive may be missing, while the latter may not be in the construct at all but rather, as construed by Targum Jonathan, the name of a city.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

וְכַלַּפּוֹת Ps 74:6 and וְאֵלַמּוֹת Ez 40:16 may also belong to this category, the singulars being כֵּלָף and אֵלָם [כֵּילָף and אֵילָם, cf. Ges.-Buhl, s. vv.].

h. e]. The form לָחֶם Ju 5:8, with Segol under the middle consonant, also belongs here [but see above § 16e].[396]

i. f]. The Ṣere is retained in a few instances of both sing. and plur., e. g. בַּעֲקֵב Gn 25:26 חֲמֵשׁ, בִּיוַן Ps 69:3, כְּאֵבֶל־אֵם ibid 35:14 (with Ṣere changed to Segol on account of the following Maḳḳef) שְׂמֵחַי ibid 35:20, חֲפֵצַי ibid 35:27, שְׁכֵחַי ibid 9:18, אֲבֵילֵי Is 61:3 [in our text אֲבֵלֵי]. The Dagesh in the ק of עִקְּבֵי Gn 49:17 is euphonic. [Cf. above § 16a].

j. g]. These constructs are not to be referred to this formation, but to their corresponding absolutes פֵּעֶל or פֶּעֶל.[397] On כָּתֵף Is 11:14 cf. *Shor.* s. v., but according to Ben Asher, the absolute form is retained in order to prevent close proximity and consequent coalescence of the final פ in כָּתֵף and the initial פ of פְלִשְׁתִּים immediately following.

k. *Rem.* The form אַחֵר may also belong here, as evidenced by the plural אֲחֵרִים. The middle radical ח is responsible for the change of the vowel preceding it from Ḳameṣ to Pathaḥ, as in טַח Is 44:18, וְתַחַשׁ Pr 31:5, יַחֵל Nu 30:3, etc. The feminine sing. אַחֶרֶת seems to point, however, to an intensive formation, on the analogy of עַוֶּרֶת Lv 22:22,, for if it were of the Ḳal formation the feminine אֲחֵרָה or אֲחֶרֶת would be expected. Two different formations are therefore to be assumed.[398]

l. h]. In some MSS. the readings יְקַר Es 1:4 and כְּתַב ibid 4:8, with Pathaḥ under the second radical, occur.[399]

m. i]. But זְמַן and מְעַט are inflected throughout with

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the sharpening of the final consonant, e. g. זְמַנִּים etc. מְעַטִּים Ec. 5:1.[a]

n. j]. On this analogy יִקְרֵי and אִסְרֵי, but אֲסָרֵי analogous to זְמַנֵּי, is also possible.[401]

o. *Rem.* 1. To the same category belong nouns of the פֶּעַל formation,[402] in which the Pathaḥ is sometimes changed to Ḳameṣ in pause, e. g. גְּבָל Ps 83:9, but גְּבָל Ez 27:9 (in some authentic MSS. גְּבַל, with Pathaḥ), חֲתַת Jb 6:21, דְּוָי Ps 41:4 צְפַּת Ju 1:17 and with affixed ה, צְפָּתָה 2Chr 14:9 [in our text צְפָתָה]. In plural: הֲדַסִּים, ... הֲדַסֵּי, אֲגַמִּים, אֲגַמֵּי, etc. The forms אַגְמֵי Is 19:10 and אַגְמֵיהֶם Ex 7:19 are not to be referred to this category.[403] The inflexion of דְּבַשׁ is modelled after the פֶּעֶל formation, e. g. דִּבְשִׁי Cn 5:1.[404] The form כִּדְוֵי Jb 6:7 may be construed as pl. constr. of דְּוָי, in place of כִּדְוְיֵי, with the rejection of the Yod radical and the shifting of its vowel backward under the Waw.[405] Ḥayyuj, however, [N. 72] regards it as plural construct of the adjective דָּוֶה.

p. *Rem.* 2. The form שַׂלְוִים Nu 11:30 is not to be taken as plur. of שְׂלָיו, but of שֵׂלָו, on the analogy of מַקֵּל, מַקְלִים or מַקְלוֹת, in which the Dagesh of the middle radical is omitted as in עִוְרִים and פִּסְחִים.[406]

q. k]. Nouns of the פְּעַל formation (כְּאֵב, זְאֵב, etc.) suffer no changes in their inflexions,[407] e. g. זְאֵבֵי Hab 1:8, בְּאֵרוֹת Gn 26:18, הַפְּאֵרִים Is 3:20 (but also פַּאֲרֵי Ex 39:28 and בֶּאֱרוֹת Gn 14:10).

r. *Rem.* 1. The form שְׁכֶם is inflected on the analogy

a. Rabbi Isaac ibn Ghiyāth [on his identity and dates see I. H. Weiss, *Dor Dor we-D.* IV, 248 f.] maintains that the Dagesh in the ט of מְעַטִּים is euphonic, like that in מִקְּדָשׁ Ex 15:17, and is not replacing the latent quiescent of the long Ḳameṣ, for the ground-form is מְעַט, with Pathaḥ.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

of its kindred noun שֶׁכֶם Ps 21:13, e. g. שִׁכְמוֹ Gn 49:15 and שִׁכְמָהּ ibid 21:14, but שֶׁכְמָה Hos 6:9, like נֶגְבָּה and הַפֶּתְחָה Gn 19:6.[408] In שְׁכֶמָה Ju 9:1, with reference to the city by this name, the original form is retained in order to distinguish it from שֶׁכְמָה Hos 6:9, meaning shoulder.

s. a*]. The form נֵרְךְ Cn 4:14 is a contraction of this formation.[410] With ה locale: הַפֶּתְחָה Gn 19:6, נֶגְבָּה Ex 40:24; but with Segol changed to Ṣere in קֵדְמָה. In pause, the first syllable generally takes Ḳameṣ. There are, however, numerous exceptions, e. g. מֶלֶךְ, צֶדֶק, תֶּבֶן, etc. In some instances non-pausal, along with pausal, forms are found in pause, e. g. כֶּסֶף [Gn 37:28] בְּכָסֶף Ps. 68:14, רֶשַׁע Ec 3:16 and רָשַׁע 1S 24:14, דֶּרֶךְ [Is 57:14] and דָּרֶךְ Ps 20:23 שֶׁקֶר and שָׁקֶר ibid 69:5, בַּסֵּתֶר ibid 139:15 and סָתֶר Dt 27:24. In אֶרֶץ the first Segol changes to Ḳameṣ, even without pause, after the article, e. g. הָאָרֶץ, לָאָרֶץ, בָּאָרֶץ.

t. b]. On the forms חֲדַר Ex 7:28 and הֲבֵל Ec 1:2 cf. above, b and d. The form דְּלָתְךָ Is 26:20, seems however to indicate a noun דְּלָת along with דֶּלֶת. Hence, perhaps, also חֲדַר is to be traced not to חֶדֶר but to a kindred noun חֲדָר.[411]

u. c]. Also בִּרְכַּיִם Dt 28:35, כִּלְאַיִם Lv 19:19, etc. But קַרְנַיִם Dn 8:3, פְּעָמָיו Ps 58:11, פְּעָמַיִךְ Cn 7:2, are to be referred to a פְּעַל formation [cf., however, above, note 393].

v. *Rem.* 1. Some of the nouns of this class occur in both פֶּעֶל and פֵּעֶל formations, e. g. שֶׂכֶל and שֵׂכֶל, נֶדֶר and נֵדֶר, נֶצַח and נֵצַח, יֶשַׁע and יֵשַׁע, etc.

w. *Rem.* 2. Numerous instances with Ḥireḳ, and a

* See table, p. 238.

II. PARADIGMS OF MASCULINE (THE SEGOLATES)[409]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Sing. absolute	* [a] מֶ֫לֶךְ (king)	סֵ֫פֶר (book)	[d] קֹ֫דֶשׁ (holiness, sanctuary)	נַ֫עַר (a youth)	נֵ֫צַח (perpetuity)	[h] פֹּ֫עַל (work)	[i] מָ֫וֶת (death)
Sing. construct	[b] מֶ֫לֶךְ	סֵ֫פֶר	קֹ֫דֶשׁ	נַ֫עַר	נֵ֫צַח	פֹּ֫עַל	[j] מוֹת
Sing. with light suff.	מַלְכִּי מַלְכְּךָ	סִפְרִי סִפְרְךָ	[e] קָדְשִׁי קָדְשְׁךָ	[g] נַעֲרִי נַעַרְךָ	נִצְחִי נִצְחֲךָ	פָּעֳלִי פָּעָלְךָ	מוֹתִי מוֹתְךָ
Sing. with grave suff.	מַלְכְּכֶם	סִפְרְכֶם	קָדְשְׁכֶם	נַעַרְכֶם	נִצְחֲכֶם	פָּעָלְכֶם	מוֹתְכֶם
Plur. absolute	† [409a] מְלָכִים	סְפָרִים	[f] קֳדָשִׁים	נְעָרִים	נְצָחִים	[411] [פְּעָלִים]	[מוֹתִים]
Plur. construct	מַלְכֵי	סִפְרֵי	קָדְשֵׁי	נַעֲרֵי	נִצְחֵי	פָּעֳלֵי	מוֹתֵי
Plur. with light suff.	מְלָכַי	סְפָרַי	קֳדָשַׁי	נְעָרַי	נְצָחַי	פְּעָלַי	מוֹתַי
Plur. with grave suff.	מַלְכֵיכֶם	סִפְרֵיכֶם	קָדְשֵׁיכֶם	נַעֲרֵיכֶם	נִצְחֵיכֶם	פָּעֳלֵיכֶם	
Dual absolute	[c] רַגְלַיִם	כִּפְלַיִם	מָתְנַיִם	נַעֲלַיִם			
Dual construct	רַגְלֵי	כִּפְלֵי	מָתְנֵי	נַעֲלֵי			

* See p. 237. † See additions and corrections, p. 378.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

few also with Segol [particularly in case of a laryngeal] under the first radical, occur, שִׁבְרוֹ Gn 44:2, חִשְׁקִי Is 21:4, יִלְדֵי ibid 57:4, בְּקִצְפִּי ibid 60:10, בְּקֶצְפְּךָ Ps 38:2, וְיֶשְׁעֲךָ ibid 85:7, כְּגֶלְלוֹ Jb 20:7, לְעֶבְרוֹ Is 47:15, עֶשְׂבָּם ibid 42:15 and חֶבְלֵי Jos 13:3.

x. *Rem*. 3. Under the influence of a final laryngeal the vowel preceding it becomes Pathaḥ, while in the case of a middle laryngeal both vowels become Pathaḥ, e. g. נֵצַח and נַעַר. Exceptions are לֶחֶם and רֶחֶם, but also רָחַם Ju 5:30 and רָחַם Ez 20:26, with pausal Ḳameṣ in the first syllable.[412]

y. d]. The contracted form קֹשְׁטְ Pr 22:21 also occurs along with קֹשֶׁט Ps 60:6 [Cf. on these two forms Koenig II, 26].

z. e]. Also with Ḳibbuṣ under the first radical, e. g. גֻּדְלוֹ Ps 150:2; קֻמְצוֹ Lv 2:2.

a' f]. We also find long Ḳameṣ under the first radical, e. g. קָדָשִׁים Ez 36:38 (also קֳדָשִׁים), קָדָשַׁי ibid 22:8 קָדָשֶׁיךָ Dt 12:26, שָׁרָשָׁיו Jb 18:16. [On the nature of this Ḳameṣ see above, note 22].[412a] The plural forms בְּקָרִים La 3:23 and כְּפָרִים Cn 4:13, also בְּשָׂמִי ibid 5:1, are to be referred to a פְּעָל formation.[413]

b' g]. Similarly with affixed ה, הַשַּׁעְרָה Dt 25:7, נַחְלָה Nu 34:5 and Ps 135:12.

c' h]. But in אֹהֶל and בֹּהֶן the Segol is not affected by the laryngeal bearing it. In the plural, the Ḥolem of אֹהֶל is frequently retained, e. g. וְאֹהָלִים Gn 13:5, לְאֹהָלָיו 2Chr 25:22, אֹהָלֶיךָ Nu 33:18 and 24:5. These may also be referred to a פּוֹעָל formation.[414] Similarly in other instances where the middle radical is a laryngeal, e. g. וְתֹאֲרוֹ Is 52:14,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

וּפָעֳלוֹ ibid 22:13. Generally, however, the Ḥaṭef Ḳameṣ [or Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf, see above, note 18] of the initial radical is shifted forward under the middle radical, while the first radical takes long Ḳameṣ [cf. Ibn Janaḥ, *Riḳ*. 221 and above, Note 22], e. g. אָהֳלֵי Ps 83:7, גָּאֳלֵי Ne 13:29, אָהֳלֹה Gn 12:8, לְאָהֳלֵיהֶם 1K 8:66, פָּעָלְךָ [Ḳameṣ under the ע in place of Ḥaṭef because of the following Shewa] Ḥab 3:2; but רָחְבּוֹ from רֹחַב and בָּאְשָׁם Is 34:3 from בָּאְשׁ (or בְּאֹשׁ Am 4:10, with the retraction of the Ḥolem and its consequent shortening to Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf) [But the original Ḥolem, or, more originally, Ḳibbuṣ, may be restored here to its former position; cf. above, note 404].

d' *Rem*. The plural forms בְּהֹנוֹת Ju 1:7, נְגֹהוֹת Is 59:9 and נְכֹחוֹת ibid 30:10 are probably derived not from the singular forms בֹּהֶן, נֹגַהּ, נֹכַח, but either from בְּהוֹנָה, נְגוֹהָה, and נְכֹחָה Am 3:10, although the first two are not extant, or from a פְּעֹל formation, on the analogy of לָשׁוֹן, לְשֹׁנוֹת.[415]

e' *i*]. To this category may also be referred the nouns שָׁוְא and perhaps also גַּיְא.[416] The Pathaḥ in the latter may be due to the analogical effect of the ־ֵנוּ in the first person plural pronominal suffixes; while the Ḳameṣ in the former is retained, perhaps, also under the influence of the pl. pronominal suffixes of the third person ־ָיו.

f' j]. Also בְּעָוֶל Ez 28:18 and בְּעָוְלוֹ ibid 18:26, from עָוֶל, and הַמָּוְתָה Ps 116:15, from מָוֶת.

§ 48. Intensive Formations

a. In forms פִּעֵל: חִבֵּל, חֵרֵשׁ, עִוֵּר Pr 23:34, שִׁלֵּם Dt 32:35, דִּבֶּר Hos 1:2 [Cf. above p. 86[a]], the vowel of the first syllable is retained in all the inflections, e. g. עִוְרִים, פִּסְחִים, שִׁקְמִים (with Dagesh in the middle radical omitted),

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

עִלְּגִים, הַמְאֲנִים Jr 13:10 [Cf. ibid.[c]]. Similarly in nouns of פַּעֵל formation: הַשָּׁרֵת Nu 4:12, רַחֵם Hab 3:2, וּמַהֵר Zp 1:14, מַקֵּל,[a] e. g. רַחֲמִים, מַקְלוֹת Ez 39:9 (but מַקַּל Gn 30:37 probably belongs to a different formation [but cf. above, note 391]). Of the same category is perhaps also בְּחַלְּקֵי Is 57:6.[418]

b. Of the פִּעָל forms:[419] אִכָּר, אִסָּר, יִסָּד Is 28:16 (in some exact MSS. יִסַּד [so in our text])[420]; the const. st. sing.: אִכַּר etc.; plur.: אִכָּרִים Joel 1:11, אִכָּרֵיכֶם Is 61:5, לְכִכָּרִים 2Chr 3:8; const. plur.: כִּכְּרֵי 2K 5:5. Of the dual כִּכָּרַיִם ibid 23 the construct כִּכְּרַיִם ibid 1, occurs.[421] To the same category may be referred the forms כֶּחָשִׁים, גֶּחָלִים Is 30:9, of which the construct is גַּחֲלֵי־ Lv 16:12 [cf. *Rik.* 60]. The Segol under the initial radical is due to the Ķameṣ in the following laryngeal, as in בֶּהָלָה, נֶאָצָה, נֶחָמָה.[422] The form אֶחָד may also belong here,[423] except for the fact that the plur. אֲחָדִים is on the analogy of the light flexions.

c. Of the form פַּעָל: סַבָּל, שַׁבָּת,[b] קַשָּׁת Gn 21:20, צַוָּאר (with א of Prolongation, which drops out in צַוָּרָם Ne 3:5), and perhaps also גֶּחָלִים, פֶּחָם cf., above; const. st.: שַׁבַּת, צַוַּאר, חָרַשׁ Is 44:12[425] (with Ķameṣ in the first syllable instead of Pathaḥ to compensate for the Dagesh in the middle consonant); plural: גַּנָּבִים, חַטָּאִים; pl. construct: חַטָּאֵי Am 9:10, חָרָשֵׁי Is 45:16; but also דַּכְּאֵי Ps 34:19 and צַוְּארֵי Gn 45:14; with suffixes: מַלָּחַיִךְ Ez 27:27, וְחַטָּאֶיהָ Is 13:9, also צַוְּארֵיכֶם Jr 27:12, שַׁבְּתוֹתַי Ex 31:13, קַשְּׁתוֹתָם Ps 37:15. A variant of the same formation is פַּעַל: פַּנַּג Ez 27:17,

a. מַקֵּל may also be regarded as derived from the stem נקל,[417] thus מַנְקֵל>מַקֵּל.

b. The forms שַׁבַּתּוֹ Is 66:23 and שַׁבַּתָּהּ Hos 2:13 point to a ground-form שַׁבָּתַת analogous to יַבֶּשֶׁת, דַּלֶּקֶת, which may have contracted to שַׁבָּת in order to avoid concurrence of two similar consonants.[424]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

אַכַּד Gn 10:10, אַחַר (the plur. of which is אַחֲרֵי, אַחֲרָיו etc.),[426] and perhaps also שַׁדַּי, פָּרָשׁ Ez 26:10 [Cf. on this form above § 47f, note 395] פָּרַס ibid 38:5 (with Ḳameṣ instead of Pathaḥ to compensate for the Dagesh in the middle consonant), and פַּדָּן Gn 25:20 (hence with affixed ה, פַּדֶּנָה ibid 5:7) [427].

§ 49. Formations with a Long Unchangeable Vowel

III. MASCULINE NOUNS WITH ONE UNCHANGEABLE VOWEL

	1.	2.	3.
Sing. absolute	[a] עוֹלָם (eternity)	אוֹיֵב (enemy)	[d] פָּקִיד (overseer)
Sing. construct	עוֹלַם	אוֹיֵב	[e] פְּקִיד
Sing. with light suff.	עוֹלָמִי עוֹלָמְךָ	אֹויְבִי אֹויִבְךָ [428] אוֹסִפְךָ 2 K 22:20	[f] פְּקִידִי פְּקִידְךָ
Sing. with grave suff	עוֹלַמְכֶם	אֹויִבְכֶם	פְּקִידְכֶם
Plur. absolute	שׁוֹפָרוֹת [b] עוֹלָמִים	[e] אֹויְבִים	[d] פְּקִידִים
Plur. construct	שׁוֹפְרוֹת עוֹלְמֵי	אֹויְבֵי	פְּקִידֵי
Plur. with light suff.	עוֹלָמַי	אֹויְבַי	פְּקִידַי
Plur. with grave suff	עוֹלְמֵיכֶם	אֹויְבֵיכֶם	פְּקִידֵיכֶם
Dual absolute	[מַלְקָחַיִם]	[מֹאזְנַיִם]	[שִׁבְעָיִם]
Dual construct		[מֹאזְנֵי]	

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

a. a]. A variant of this formation is דּוֹנַג Ps 68:3, אוֹפַן Ez 1:15 and 10:10 in some MSS. [so in our text], כּוֹבַע ibid 27:10, קוֹבַע ibid 23:24. Ḥayyuj [N. 126] reads the last two instances with Ḳameṣ in the second syllable.

b. b]. It occurs also with the sharpening of the final consonant preceded by unchangeable Pathaḥ, e. g. שׁוֹשַׁנִּים, אוֹפַנֵּי 1K 7:30, etc. [see above, note 394].

c. c]. The Ṣere is retained in the plural forms שׁוֹמֵמִים La 1:16 שׁוֹמֵמוֹת Is 49:8, תּוֹפֵפוֹת Ps 68:26, סוֹחֵרָה ibid 91:4.[429]

d. d]. The characteristics of this category; namely, the changing of the initial vowel to Shewa and the retention of the second vowel, are shared by the forms פָּעוֹל (כָּבוֹד, שָׁלוֹם, etc.) and פָּעוּל (שָׁבוּעַ, חָרוּל, etc.). The form אֲרוֹן in אֲרוֹן אֶחָד 2K 12:10 is in the construct state, but in אֲרוֹן אֶחָד 2Chr 24:8 it is in the absolute, of the פָּעוֹל formation.[430]

e. e]. Before a Maḳḳef the Ḥolem of the פָּעוֹל forms changes to Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf, e. g. טְהָר־לֵב Pr 22:11, וּגְדָל־כֹּחַ Na 1:3, and, with Ḥaṭef Ḳameṣ in the first radical, וּטֳהָר־ יָדַיִם Jb 17:9.[431] Similarly even without Maḳḳef in קְבָל 2K 15:10, קֳטָבְךָ Hos 13:14. In קֳטָנִּי 1K 12:10 and קֳבָלּוֹ Ez 26:9 the Ḥatef Ḳameṣ followed by Dagesh in the final consonant is in place of Ḥolem with Waw of Prolongation.[432]

f. f]. The initial vowel is retained in שָׁלִישׁוֹ 2K 9:25, שָׁלִישִׁים Ex 14:7, שָׁלִישָׁיו ibid 15:4 (in order to differentiate these from שְׁלִישִׁים 2K 1:13 "thirds") [So Stade § 209]; also in בָּגוֹדָה Jr 3:7 (for בְּגוֹדָה)[433] and נָפֹצֶת 2S 18:8 for נְפוֹצָה, with fem. characteristic ת replacing the ה (but see above § 37k). In the plur. of שָׁבוּעַ the Ḳameṣ is retained

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

(e. g. שֲׁבֻעִים Dn 9:25, and ibid 10:2, שֲׁבֻעוֹת Dt 16:9 and בְּשָׁבֻעֹתֵיכֶם Nu 28:26) in order to distinguish it from שְׁבֻעוֹת Ez 21:28, the plur. of שְׁבוּעָה; but in the constr., שְׁבֻעַ Gn 29:27 and שְׁבֻעוֹת Ez 45:21.[434]

g. g]. A Dagesh in the final consonant sometimes replaces the long vowel of the second radical, e. g. שְׂעִפִּים Jb 4:13, נְחִתִּים 2K 6:9, חֲבִתִּים 1 Chr 9:13;[435] of פְּעַל forms: עֲרֻמִּים, נְקֻדִּים, אֲדֻמִּים, עֲבֻתָּה Ez 6:13 (also עֲבוֹתִים and עֲבֹתוֹת) and of פְּעוֹל forms חֲרֻלִּים Pr 24:31.

§ 50. Formations with Unchangeable Vowels

a. The following formations remain unchanged in the constr. and under the influence of suffixes

1. פְּעִיל: מְחִיר, אֱוִיל, etc.

b. 2. פְּעוֹל: שְׁאוֹר, תְּהוֹם, שְׂמֹאל (with א in place of Waw of Prolongation),[435a] e. g. בִּגְדוֹל Ex 15:16, גְּבֹהַּ 1S 16:7,[435b] תְּאוֹמֵי Cn 4:5 (or from תָּאוֹם).

c. 3. פְּעוּל: כְּרוּב, אֱשׁוּן Pr 20:20, פְּדוּיֵי Nu 3:46.

d. 4. פַּעִיל: צַדִּיק, לַפִּיד, סָרִיס, עָרִיץ (with long Ḳameṣ to compensate for the missing Dagesh of the middle consonant), e. g. וְסָרִיסֵי Ex 6:14 [but סְרִיסֵי פַּרְעֹה Gn 40:7, cf. above, note 425].

e. 5. פַּעוֹל: הָרַתּוֹק Ez 7:23, וְכַמֹּן Is 28:27, קַנּוֹא Na 1:2 e. g. בָּרַתּוּקוֹת 1K 6:21 (with Shureḳ instead of Ḥolem); but וּרְתוּקוֹת Is 40:19 is from רָתוּק.

f. 6. פַּעוּל: תַּנּוּר, עַמּוּד, חַנּוּן, e. g. טַבּוּר הארץ Ju 9:37, חַלּוּקֵי 1S 17:40, וּבַחוּרֵי Ps 78:31 (with virtual doubling of the ח); but בְּחוּרֵי 2S 10:9 is from בָּחוּר, while מִבְּחֻרָיו Nu 11:28 is a noun on the analogy of מִנְּעֻרָיו [from בְּחוּרִים].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The forms חֲרוּצִים Pr 10:4 and בְּחוּנָיו Is 23:13 also belong here.

g. 7. פִּיעוֹל: קִיטוֹר Gn 19:28, צִינוֹק Jr 29:26.

h. 8. פְּעוֹל: צִפּוֹר, קִמּוֹשׁ, יִסּוֹר Jb 40:2 [but see above, p. 86[a]]. In the plur. of צִפּוֹר, however, the Ḥolem changes to Ḥaṭef Ḳameṣ צִפֳּרִים [but see below, note 469]. To the same category belongs, perhaps, also the form עֵירוֹם Ez 18:16, as evidenced by the plur. עֵירֻמִּים Gn 3:7.

i. 9. פְּעוּל: צִבּוּר, שִׁקּוּץ, e. g. גִּדּוּפֵי Ze 2:8, בִּכּוּרֵי Nu 18:13, לִמּוּדֵי Is 54:13, and perhaps also זֵרוּעֶיהָ Is 61:11.

j. 10. פּוֹעִיל: אוֹפִיר Gn 10:29, אוֹכִיל Hos 11:4 [so Ibn Janaḥ *Riḳ*. 36, but see above § 35e and note 198].

k. 11. פֵּעוֹל or פֵּעוּל: אֵזוֹר, אֵזוֹב, עֵירוֹם (with distinct quiescent Yod in the first syllable,), אֵבוּס, אֵטוּן, e. g. אֵבוּס בְּעָלָיו Is 1:3, אֵטוּן מִצְרָיִם Pr 7:16, אֵפוֹד בָּד 1S 2:18, אֵזוֹר חֲלָצָיו Is 5:27. The form אֲבוּסֶךָ Jb 39:9 probably belongs to a different type.[a] [436]

§ 51. Less Frequent Formations

a. In addition to these the following forms occur: 1. פּוֹעֶל or פּוּעֶל: עוּגָב, יוֹקֵשׁ (יְקֻשִׁים Ec 9:12), מוֹעֵד, (מוּעֶדֶת Pr 25:19) [but see above § 24i and note 143], יוֹבֵל Jr 17:8 [in our text יוּבַל] אוּלָם (with unchangeable

a. But the forms אֵמוּנִים Pr 14:5 from אֵמֻן Dt 32:20 and אֵסוּרָיו Ju 15:14 from אֵסוּר Jr 37:15 indicate the possibility of a plur. with the Ṣere changed to compound Shewa.[437] Similarly אֵיכָה אֵזוֹבֵי קִיר בָּיִם[438] and מה יעשו איפה איזובי קיר Moed Ḳaṭan 25 b. In עֵירֻמִּים Gn 3:7, however, the Ṣere is unchanged probably on account of the quiescent Yod following it, or it may belong to the פֵּעוּל formation (cf. supra, h).[439]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ḳameṣ אוּלָם הָעַמּוּדִים 1K 7:6),[440] הוּתַל Is 44:20,[441] סוּגַר Ez 19:9 (but Ben Naftali reads it mil'el with two pashtas).

b. 2. פֻּעָל or פְּעָל (with Dagesh in the second radical); אֻמָּן Cn 7:2, לֻקַּח 2K 2:10, אֻכַּל Ex 3:2, סֻלָּם, גּוּמָּץ [Ec 10:8], יוּלָּד Ju 13:8.[442]

c. 3. פְּעוֹל: סְבֻּלּוֹ Is 9:2 [in our text סֻבֳּלוֹ], מִסֻּבְּכוֹ Jr 4:7 (with Shewa under the second radical instead of Ḥaṭef-Ḳameṣ like בְּכֻתְּנֹתָם Lv 10:5, in place of בְּכֻתֳּנוֹתָם [so in our text], from כֻּתֹּנֶת, the feminine of this formation).[a]

d. 4. פּוּעוֹל: חוּרוֹן Jos 10:11.11.

e. 5. פּוּעָל: שׁוּנֵם 2K 4:8 and the fem. adjective שׁוּנַמִּית ibid :11, אֻזֵּן 1Chr 7:24 (with Dagesh in place of long vowel).

f. 6. פֻּוּעְלוּ: בֹּכְרוּ 1Chr 8:38, and according to Ibn Janaḥ תֹהוּ וָבֹהוּ Gn 1:2 are in place of תֹּהְיוּ and בֹּהְיוּ.[444]

g. 7. Nouns with the adjectival termination ִי,[445] e. g. פָּעְלִי, פִּעְלִי, פְּעוּלִי, and פְּעִילִי: חָפְשִׁי, נָכְרִי, נָעֳמִי (with Ḥaṭef Ḳameṣ under the ע and long Ḳameṣ under the Nun [see on this Ḳameṣ above, note 22]), עִבְרִי, תַּחְתִּי, with Segol under the first radical שֶׂכְוִי Jb 38:36[446] and פֶּלְאִי Ju 13:18,[446a] יְהוּדִי, עֲרִירִי. To these paradigms belong also the forms לֵוִי (in place of לְוִיִי or לְוִיִּי on the analogy of עִבְרִי or עֲרִירִי) and שֵׁנִי (in place of שְׁנִיִי like שְׁלִישִׁי, רְבִיעִי, etc.)[447] This termination ִי is usually rejected when it concurs with another Yod. Hence the plur. forms עִבְרִים, נָכְרִים (but also הָעִבְרִיִּים Ex 3:18), יְהוּדִים, עֲרִירִים. In תַּחְתִּיִם שְׁנִיִּם Gn 6:16 and לְוִיִּם the Yod plur. is omitted. [cf. above, note 373a].

h. Rem. This characteristic of contraction for euphonic

a. This may, however, be referred to שָׂבָךְ [=סְבָךְ] 2S 18:9 on the analogy of קִמְּצוֹ from קֹמֶץ, with euphonic Dagesh in the ב.[443]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

reasons is common in Hebrew [particularly in patronymics and tribal names], e. g. הַכַּרְמִי Nu 26:6 and הַגּוּנִי ibid:48 for הַכַּרְמִיִּי and הַגּוּנִיִּי. Similarly הַתִּמְנִי Ju 15:6 from תִּמְנָה, הַבְּרִיעִי Nu 24:44 from בְּרִיעָה. The final ה is sometimes changed in this case to ת or to Nun, e. g. הַצָּרְעָתִי 1Chr 2:53 from צָרְעָה, הַפּוּנִי Nu 26:23 from פֻּוָה, הַשֵּׁלָנִי ibid:20 from שֵׁלָה, הַשִּׁילוֹנִי 1K 1:29 from שִׁילֹה, הַגִּילֹנִי, 2S 15:12 from גִּילֹה.[448] The ending ־ִי is omitted altogether in לְיִמְנָה מִשְׁפַּחַת הַיִּמְנָה Nu 26:44, לִמְנַשֶּׁה מִשְׁפַּחַת הַמְנַשֶּׁה ibid. In לְנַעֲמָן מִשְׁפַּחַת הַנַּעֲמִי ibid:40 the final Nun is dropped.

i. 8. פַּעֲלִי: מַהֲרַי, פַּעֲרַי, נַחֲרַי 2S 28.35.37; שַׁדַּי for שַׁדְדַי[449] [but cf. above §48c], and, according to my father, אַחֲרַי Pr 28:23, which he construes as an adjective in the sense of *a backward* or *perverted person* [*Zik*. 12.][450]

j. 9. פְּעָלָה or פַּעְלָה [פְּעָלָה]: לְבֵנָה, אִשָּׁה, תָּפְתֶּה Is 30:33, עַלְפֶּה Ez 31:15 [but see above § 24h];[450a] construct sing. אִשֵּׁה Lv 1:9, צִחֵה Is 5:13 [with virtual doubling of the ח]; constr. plur. אִשֵּׁי Lv 21:6.1. The initial vowel does not change in the flexions.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOTES: CHAPTER FOUR, B

[391] Ḥayyuj (N. 124) regards הֲבָל as a unique instance (כי אין לה דומה), but Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 121) and Ibn Ezra (*Moz.* 29a and comment. to Ex 13:12) cite numerous other examples of the פְּעַל formation, which are analogously inflected (cf. also below, t). In all the instances given by them, however, the second radical has Pathaḥ. The form הֲבָל is therefore peculiar and is perhaps to be regarded as an Aramaic form, on the analogy of צְלֵם, מְלֵךְ, עֲבֵד (cf. Delitzsch, commentary ad loc.). For the construct forms חֲלֵב and לְבֶן Stade § 202a assumes the secondary absolutes חָלֵב and לָבֵן; but according to Koenig II, 74 f., the same phonetic principle which operates in the interchange, in the case of pausal forms, of *ĕ* and *ā* (e. g. אֶרֶץ and אָרֶץ) is also operative, conversely, in the case of the tone-less vowels *ĕ* and *a* (לְבֶן for לְבַן); cf. the constructs, on the other hand, זְקַן, יְתַר, etc. of the type זָקֵן, יָתֵר, etc. See also below, note 408.

[392] But according to some modern grammarians these three instances are segolate descendants of their respective קְטַל (*Ḳităl*) ground-form and are evolved regularly by the Aramaic method of inflection (Margolis, *AJSL*, XII, p. 214; cf. also Koenig II, 78). See below, notes 397 and 404.

[393] So also קְרָנַיִם (קְרָנָיו Dn 8:3 ff.). Koenig II, 16 f. sees in these forms the tendency to assimilate in form the duals to the plurals; but for דְּלָתַיִם and דְּלָתָיו Is 26:2 he presupposes a ground-form דָּלָה (II, 177). Cf. also below, t.

[394] The sharpening of the third radical in these instances, as well as in such examples as פְּתַיּוּת Pr 9:13, בְּרֻדִּים Gn 31:10, etc. (for פְּתָיוּת, בְּרֻדִים, etc.), is due according to Lagarde, *Ue.* § 17, to the attempt of the masoretes to justify grammatically or orthographically the pronunciation of the short vowel (*ă* and *ŭ*) in the second radical. The grammatical sense of the masoretes could not, otherwise, permit a short vowel to occur in an open unaccented syllable. However, since the Dagesh preceded the vowel-signs in the process of the development of our vowel-system (cf. Chomsky, *JQR.*, N. S., XXXII, p. 45), it is more logical to assume that the reverse is the case. The masoretes, in all likelihood, employed the short vowels in order to justify the sharpening of the respective letters. Cf. also below, note 435.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

395 But below § 48c Ḳimḥi is rather inclined to refer פַּרְשׁ, after Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 415) to the קְטַל (or קְטָל) form, as evidenced by the plur. פָּרָשִׁים. According to Ewald § 339 the Pathaḥ in פָּרַשׁ indicates the construct state, which is employed here, as in חָכְמַת וָדָעַת Is 33:6 and גִּילַת וְרַנֵּן ibid 35:2, to express close connection to the following word with the Waw copulative (תַּלְגִּל) in the sense of *with*, and not genitive relationship. So also Koenig, Syntax 420; but in חָכְמַת and גִּילַת he sees merely a reversion to the old feminine ending *ath* (cf. above, note 365), which reversion is, however, effected by this close relationship.

396 It is so regarded also by some modern grammarians (cf. Koenig II, 34). Ewald 296, note 1, reads here *loḥém*, with Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf under the ל, and he construes it as Pu'al ("*es wurden erobert*"). See also above, note 85.

397 This is contrary to Ḥayyuj (N. 124) who regards these forms as constructs of קָטֵל, but Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 122 and 124) suggests the possibility of presupposing a קְ טַ ל ground-form for these constructs. So also Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik*. 25). According to Margolis, however, these Segolate constructs are normally evolved from the Aramaically inflected forms, thus כָּתֵף>כַּתְפִּי or כִּתְפִּי* (according to the Aramaic method)>כִּתְפִּי, כְּתֵפְכֶם>כְּתֵף>כֶּתֶף, etc. (cf. *AJSL*., XII, 218 f.). It is also likely that an original *kátif* yielded either *katf* (=כֶּתֶף) or, with accent shifted forward, *katíf* (=כְּתַף); cf. Brock. *GvG*. I, 108.

398 According to Stade § 80, 2, the original short *ă* is here retained with the virtual doubling of the ח, instead of changing to the pre-tonic Ḳameṣ as in the case of the other קְטַל forms. Hence the Pathaḥ is preserved in אַחֲרַת. Cf. also Koenig II, 461.

399 These forms are to be traced back to *ḳitâl* ground-forms, in which the long *â* escaped obscuring in *ô* (cf. above, note 368), because they came into the language rather late and were borrowed bodily from the Aramaic (cf. Barth § 42c, also Koenig II, 140 and 355). The Ḳameṣ is therefore generally unchangeable, cf. also the following note.

400 This is the traditional pronunciation, although in the corresponding examples in the Bible the Ḳameṣ is permanent (cf. עֲבָדֵיהֶם Ec 9:1, מְצָדוֹת סְלָעִים Is 33:16, also preceding note). The operation of the principle of analogy is distinctly evident here (cf. דִּבְרֵי, בִּגְדֵי, etc.). These forms are therefore legitimate. On the principle of analogy in other languages, see *The History of Language* by Strong, H. A.; Logeman, W. S.; Wheeler, B. I., chapter V.

401 Cf. אֱסָרָהּ, אֱסָרֶיהָ and אֱסָרָהּ Nu 30:5.6.8.15. Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 42)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

presupposes the ground-form אֵסָר, or "perhaps" אֱסָר. According to Barth § 42 אִסָּר Nu 30:3 etc. also belongs to this category, with the sharpening of the ס in order to preserve the original short Ḥireḳ (but see above, note 394). Cf. also Lagarde, op. cit. 178 and Koenig II, 141.

[402] These forms arose, according to Barth § 71, on the analogy of the intransitive *a*-infinit.: שְׁכַב, שְׁפַל, נְגַע; while Margolis (*AJSL.*, XII, 213) traces them back to a ground-form קְטַל or קְטֹל, the construct state of which (קְטֹל) is used for the absolute, in accordance with the Aramaic method; cf. also Ges.-K. § 84ᵃc.

[403] The form אֻנְסִי is referred by some of the modern grammarians to a ground-form אֻנֻס; cf. Koenig II, 80.

[404] This form points to a disyllabic origin *dibash*, in which the tone, originally on the penultima, shifted forward to the ultima, giving rise, in accordance with the Aramaic method, to the form דְבַשׁ (cf. the Arabic *dibs*). On the same principle are to be explained forms like בְּאֵר and בְּאשׁ Am 4:10; namely, as pointing to a ground-form *fi'il* and *fu'ul*; cf. Lagarde, op. cit. 57 f. This disyllabic ground-form is assumed also for the Segolates קֶטֶל, קֵטֶל, קֹטֶל (see below, notes 407 and 409; also Mueller, *ZDMG.*, XLV, 226 and Philippi, *ZDMG.*, XLIX, 208).

[405] This is probably after Ibn Ezra ad loc. (חוּלְיֵי נוֹפֵי). Ewald § 213e takes it as the construct of the sing. דְּוַי, cf. שְׂדֵי Ru 1:1.2.6.22, 2:6 of שָׂדַי (cf. above § 45d). So also Koenig II, 67. Cf., however, Ben Yehuda s. vv. דְּוַי and כָּדָו.

[406] The singular is according to Lagarde, op. cit. 190, שְׂלָוָה = Arabic *salwā(i)* (cf. Ibn Janaḥ, *Shor.* 516) and Syriac *salway*. The word is foreign, hence the שׂ is retained and not changed to שׁ in Hebrew as is usually the case. Koenig II, 119c traces back to this ground-form also שְׂלָיו, which evolved, in his opinion, after the ה had been dropped, in place of שְׂלָו because of the vowel-like nature of the Waw. Lagarde, however, presupposes the form *silw* or *sulw* as the basis for שְׂלָיו.

[407] These forms are referred by some of the modern grammarians to original disyllabic forms, in which the tone has been shifted from the penultima to the ultima, with the assimilation of the vowel in the second syllable to that of the first. Cf. Philippi, *ZDMG.*, XLIX, p. 208; Ges.-K. § 84ᵃe; also Margolis, *AJSL.*, XII, 225f.; and above, note 404.

[408] In שְׁכֶם the Ḥireḳ (resulting from assimilation, see preceding note) is not changed to Ṣere as in the other instances but to Segol, on account of the laryngeal character of the כ; cf. לְכָתֵי, נֶכְדֵי, etc. (Koenig II, 506). Stade § 199a, however, refers it to the category of the פְּעַל

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

forms (cf. above, note 402) in which the short ă is modified to ĕ. Cf. above, note 391, Koenig's explanation of לָבֵן (from לְבָן) in place of לָבָן.

[409] On the origin and character of the Segolates see Ges.-K. § 84a, also above, note 404. Cf. also Joüon § 96A.

[410] This is probably due to its foreign origin (Persian: *nard*), according to Koenig II, 25.

[411] This is contrary to Ḥayyuj (N. 124), Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 123) and Ibn Ezra (Moz. 29a, also note on Ḥayyuj, loc. cit.), who prefer to regard these as peculiar forms of the Segolate nouns. The opinion which Ḳimḥi favors here is that suggested by his father in *Zikkaron* 21. Cf. also above, notes 391, 393, 397, and 404.

[412] The Disciples Of Menaḥem (*Tesh*. 56) and even Ḥayyuj (N. 122) still include such forms as נַעַר and נַחַל in the category of פַּעַל formations. But Saadia (comment. to *Yeṣirah*, ed. Lambert, p. 78) already recognized them as Segolates, with changes of Segol to Pathaḥ on account of the laryngeals.

[412a] The vocalization of these plural forms bears further testimony to the assumption that the long Ḳameṣ was pronounced *o* by the Tiberian Masoretes, in consonance with the so-called Ashkenazic pronunciation, and not *ā*, as pronounced by the Sephardim. The change of the Ḥolem to *ā* is inconceivable. On the other hand, the Babylonian Jews, who pronounced the long Ḳameṣ consistently *ā* (cf. above, note 22) wrote קֻדָשִׁים (*ḳudāshim*) and שֻׁרָשִׁים (*shurāshim*). When the Spanish Jews adopted the Babylonian pronunciation (cf. ibid.) they had to reconcile the biblical text of the Tiberian Masoretes, based on the Palestinian pronunciation, with the Babylonian pronunciation. This resulted in the confusion among the Sephardim as regards the pronunciation of the Tiberian Ḳameṣ (cf. ibid.).

It should be noted that the Palestinian pronunciation of the vowel represented by Ḳameṣ, to which reference is made here, applies only to the pronunciation in vogue during the activities of the Tiberian Masoretes; namely, during the 8th century. Prior to that period, this vowel must have been pronounced *ā* as in Babylonia; cf. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, 1947, 53 f.

[413] According to Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 125) the plural forms בְּקָרִים and כְּפָרִים of this formation are also possible. As to בָּשְׂמֵי Ibn Janaḥ is uncertain whether to refer it to the פֹּעַל, or to the פֹּעֶל or פֻּעַל formations (ibid. 123). In criticising Saadia for taking אֳהָלִים Nu 24:6 as plur. of אֹהֶל, Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Saadia* 1) asserts that the Ḥolem in these instances changes to Ḥaṭef Ḳameṣ and not to Ḥaṭef Pathaḥ

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

(or to Shewa, by implication). See also David b. Abraham, *Jāmi' al-Alfāẓ* I, 408, 524.

[414] Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 61) suggests that אֳהָלִים etc. be referred to the פּוֹעָל formation, like עוֹלָלִים La 4:14. This view is, however, incorrect. These forms are to be explained on the same principle as פָּעֳלוֹ and תָּאֳרוֹ; cf. Ges.-K. § 93r, also Bauer-Leander 240 and above, note 91.

[415] Cf. Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 283: לִנְגֹהוֹת ... על משקל בארץ נְכֹחוֹת). The form נְגֹהוֹת is traced back to the singular נְגֹהָה also by Ges.-Buhl s. v., but see Ges.-K. § 93r and Koenig II, 37. According to the latter, the Ḥolem is shifted from the initial to the middle radicals in all these instances because of their laryngeal sounds (ה, ג, כ). Ben Yehuda s. v. בהן adduces with regard to בֹּהֶן and בְּהֹנוֹת the analogous forms in vuglar Arabic *bāhim* = בֹּהֶן and *bihām* = בְּהוֹן. Cf. also above, note 404.

[416] Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 500) is uncertain whether the א in שָׁוְא is to be regarded as a radical or not. He is likewise perplexed in regard to its formation. Ḳimḥi, however, recognizes its proper formation, and his view is accepted also by modern grammarians (cf. Barth § 80a and Koenig II, 48). Ḳimḥi seems also to be guided by sound linguistic sense in his etymology of גיא; cf. Ben Yehuda s. v. and Ges.-K. § 93u, v.

[417] Such a stem does not exist in Hebrew, unless Ḳimḥi assumes a stem נקל derived from the Nif'al of קלל, on the analogy of the mishnic נמך (cf. הנבוה מְנֻמִּיכוֹ Sifre, Nu 83) from מוך.

[418] But most of the modern grammarians refer it to the קְטָל formation, with Dagesh *dirimens* in the ל to make the Shewa more audible. On the nature of this Dagesh see above, notes 47 and 77.

[419] The Ḳameṣ in these instances, as well as those of the following category (קַטָּל), is derived from an originally long Pathaḥ (*Ḳattāl*), according to Barth, § 33c, over against Stade § 217a; hence it is unchangeable. On the reason for its becoming Ḳameṣ, after the Aramaic fashion, instead of Ḥolem, as is usally the case in Hebrew, see Barth, loc. cit., note 3.

[420] Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 60), likewise, regards it as an adjective; but most of the moderns read it, with the LXX, יִסַּר; cf. Stade § 483a and Ges.-Buhl s. v.

[421] Cf. in this connection Koenig II, 91 and Ges.-K. § 88b; also Bauer-Leander 234 ("wohl eine compromissform zwischen St. abs. and St. constr."). See above § 45h.

[422] These belong more likely to the type קְטָל, with Pathaḥ changed to Segol before the laryngeals with Ḳameṣ, because of dissimilation, cf. above § 9h.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[423] So Ibn Ezra, *Yesod Mispar*, attached to Pinsker's *Mabo*, p. 133; as explained by Pinsker in his note ad loc. Cf. also Solomon Dubno in Mendelssohn's commentary (*Bi'ur*), Gn 3:22 and 26:10. This is also the view held by most of the moderns. The plur. form אֲחָדִים is, however, baffling. Pinsker (op. cit. note 30) refers it to the singular אָחָד. So also Stade § 327b. According to Koenig II, 207, the original form *aḥád* (Ethiopic *aḥadū*') developed into *aḥ[ḥ]ád* (or *aeḥ[ḥ]ád*) by dissimilation), in place of the regular אֲחָד, on account of the tendency of the ח to virtual doubling. Because of its frequent occurrence and by force of analogy, the original obsolute אֶחָד, found in numerous instances in the Bible, is employed also in the construct state, instead of the expected אַחַד (from אָחָד). But in the plural the regular form אֲחָדִים is restored.

[424] So Ibn Ezra (*Ṣ*. 37b) and Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik*. 8), also Koenig II, 180. Others construe it as a קַטָּל formation; see Bauer-Leander 476. This would explain the masculine gender of this word in the majority of cases in the Bible (cf. Is 56:2.6, 58:2.13, etc.); but in the Talmud the word is consistently employed in the fem. gender, probably under the analogical influence of nouns with the regular ת-feminine ending. The Dagesh in the third radical is intended to preserve the preceding short vowel, according to Bauer-Leander; but see above, note 394.

[425] The opinion that חָרָשׁ is to be referred to this category is quoted anonymously by Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 58). Ibn Janaḥ himself, however, prefers to regard it as פָּעָל, like חָכָם, with the initial Ḳameṣ occasionally unchanged, like in סָרִיסִים Is 39:6 over against סְרִיסֵי Gn 40:7; but also חֲרָשִׁים Is 3:3. Ibn Ezra, on the other hand, maintains that חָרָשׁ is not a פָּעָל but a פַּעָּל formation (op. cit. 37a). So also the modern grammarians (Koenig II, 89). In חֲרָשִׁים Is 3:3 the initial Ḳameṣ is modified to Shewa (or Ḥaṭef) by force of analogy, according to Koenig (ibid.).

[426] אַחֲרֵי, אַחֲרָיו, etc. are construed as plurals also by most of the modern grammarians (Ewald § 217 l; Koenig II, 305 ff.; Ges.K.§ 103n; etc.). According to Ewald the original form is אַחֲרֵי, while אַחַר is a later and abbreviated form. So also Koenig II, 308, who adduces in support of this opinion the exclusive occurrence in the Mishna of אַחַר, in place of אַחֲרֵי, except when it takes the suffixes. Barth (*ZDMG*, XLII, 348 ff.; also *Nb*. 375 ff.) maintains, however, that אַחֲרָיו etc., as well as תַּחְתָּיו etc. are formed on the false analogy of לְפָנַי and עָלַי (constructs of לִפְנֵי and עֲלֵי); see below, note 614. According to Lambert § 192, note 2, this *ay* ending is in effect an original fem. sing. ending (cf. below, note 475), cf. אַשְׁרֵי etc.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

427 פֶּדֶן occurs only in the construct state, while in the absolute state the form is פַּדָּן Gn 48:7. Hence the Ḳameṣ as in קָרְבָנָה, cf. above, § 46g. But according to Ḳimḥi the Segol (pathaḥ ḳaṭan) is in place of the regular pathaḥ.

428 The reading in our text is אֹסְפְךָ. It is construed as a participle Ḳal, with the restoration of the original *i*, also by some of the moderns (cf. Ges.-K. § 61h).

429 Further instances with pre-tonic Ṣere are cited by Koenig II, 187 and 189. The preservation of this Ṣere is probably to be traced to the influence of the sing. absolute formations. However, as a rule, the short Ṣere or Ḥolem is generally reduced to Shewa in an open unaccented syllable, especially after a permanent vowel; cf. above § 48a and below § 58d and note 469.

430 But in his commentary ad loc. Ḳimḥi construes the latter also as construct. That the absolute is אָרוֹן is maintained also by Torczyner (*Devir* II, 67). According to Ibn Ezra (*S. B.* 38b) "all grammarians" assume the absolute אָרוֹן alongside of אֲרוֹן, although he himself regards אֲרוֹן as construct.

431 This is probably due to the influence of the following O-sound and the preceding U-sound (Ges.-K. § 10h). This vocalization is in consonance with the masoretic tradition with regard to the pronunciation of the Shewa as set forth by Ben Naftali and the medieval grammarians, cf. above § 4ab and notes 23 and 24.

432 So Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 134) and Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik.* 23). Ḥayyuj, however, regards the ending נִי in קְטָנִי as pronominal suffix (cf. above § 46b) to which the third radical Nun is assimilated; see *Noviye Materiali*, ed. Kokowzoff [text], p. 5). Some of the modern grammarians refer these two forms, as well as קָטְבְךָ, to the ground-form קָטֹל (cf. Ewald § 255b, Stade § 206); but Koenig II, 68 f. assumes the absolute קְטֹל. For קְטָנִי and קְבָלוֹ Koenig prefers to read קֳטָנִי and קֳבָלוֹ, with proleptical *ŏ* under the ק on account of its difficult articulation. So also Ges.-K. § 93q, according to whom the Ḥatef-Ḳameṣ under the second radical in קָטֳנִי, found in some editions, "is merely intended to mark the vowel expressly as *o*." Cf. Pinsker, *Mabo* 70 and 179, note 11; also הוריית הקורא, ed. Derenbourg, p. 66, according to whose testimony it seems that some ancient MSS. employed consistently the Ḥaṭef-Ḳameṣ to indicate the Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf. The appended Shewa may have been intended, according to some, in countries where the Ḳameṣ was pronounced ā (Spain, etc.), to call attention to the distinction between

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

it and the Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf (cf. Kahle, Bauer-Leander 101, also *Mas. des Westens* 58). See above § 3a and note 18.

[433] Ḳimḥi follows Parḥon s. v. and his father (op. cit.) in regard to this form. The same view is offered by Ibn Janaḥ in *Shor.* 55, but in *Riḳ.* 87 he prefers to construe it as a participle, in place of בּוֹגֵדָה. Modern grammarians likewise regard בָּגוֹדָה as the fem. of בָּגוֹד (Ewald § 152b; Stade § 207b; Koenig II, 194; etc.). The retention of the Ḳameṣ under the ב is due, according to Brockelmann (quoted in Ges.-K. 84^{a}k), to the Aramaic influence, "the punctuators having in mind the Aramaic nomen agentis *ḳāṭōl*."

[434] So also Ewald § 212e and Koenig II, 138f. Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 494) regards שְׁבֻעוֹת Ez 45:21 as composed of שָׁבוּעַ and שִׁבְעַת, while Parḥon s. v. takes it in the sense of שִׁבְעָה (seven) only. So also Ḳimḥi in *Shor.* s. v. According to Pinsker (Ibn Ezra's *Yesod Mispar*, attached to *Mabo*, note 156) the plural שָׁבֻעִים indicates *weeks* in the common meaning, שָׁבֻעוֹת — *the Festival of Weeks*, while שְׁבֻעוֹת refers to Passover, that is, the festival of beginning the counting of the seven weeks.

[435] For the last two examples Koenig II, 81 assumes a ground-form נַחַת and חֲבַת, while the instances quoted in the following category (קָטֹל) clearly point to a ground-form *ḳātŭl* which is lengthened to *ḳātōl*, but in which the short *ŭ* returns before the formative additions in order to protect the sharpening of the following consonant. Koenig II, 84 and Ges.-K. § 93kk are wrong in maintaining that the reverse is the case; namely, that the sharpening of the consonant is employed in order to guard the short vowel; cf. above, note 394.

[435a] But the reading שְׂמֹאול Nu 20:17 etc., also שְׂמֹאולְךָ Ez 39:3, points to an original form שְׂמָאול; cf. Arabic *sham'al* beside *shimāl* and Aramaic שׂמאלא<שְׂמָאלָא; cf. Levias *Diḳ. Aramith Bablith* § 11.

[435b] These two forms may, however, be referred to the regular Segolate basic formations (גֹּדֶל, גָּבְהַּ); see above, note 404.

[436] Both in the Lyk and in the Fürth editions, as well as in *Shor.* s. v. Ḳimḥi reads אֲבוּסֶיךָ plene, with Yod after the ס. In our masoretic text, however, it occurs without the Yod pluralis. Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 128) likewise reads it without Yod pluralis, but he suggests the possibility of construing it as a plural defectively written. All the forms in this category with initial radical א are referred by some of the modern grammarians to the קֵטֹל formation, in which the Ṣere under the א takes the place of the regular Ḥaṭef-Segol (Ges.-K. § 84^{a}q); see also above, note 306.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

437 According to the modern grammarians, however, the original Shewa, or compound Shewa, reasserts itself here (cf. preceding note).

438 The reference is, according to M. Hekhis (adnot. ad loc., p. 156b), to Ibn Gabirol's elegy on his patron Jekuthiel. There, howeve, the reading given in the edition of Bialik-Ravnitski is מָה יַּעֲשׂוּ אִיפוֹא אֲוֹבַי קִיר בְּיַד נִקְצְרוּ (*Shire Shlomo Ibn Gabirol* I, 54).

439 The latter opinion is suggested by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 64), the Ṣere under the ע being, then, for compensatory lengthening. So also Barth § 27g and Koenig II, 120. But Ewald § 163c and Stade § 295 refer this form to the stem עור, with the ending ום– as in פִּדְיוֹם, etc. and with dissimilation of vowels, in place of עוּרוֹם, as in the case of חִיצוֹן and תִּיכוֹן (cf. Barth, *Nb.*, Introduction XXIX; also Ges.-K. § 27w).

440 This is one of the thirteen instances listed by the Masora (cf. Ben Asher *Diḳduḳe* 38, note a) in which the Ḳameṣ is retained in the construct state.

441 It is also regarded as פּוּעַל by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 62) and by the anonymous author of the Hebrew grammar, published by Poznanski, p. 9. The modern grammarians, however, regard it as Hof'al of חלל (cf. above, note 127). See also above, note 142.

442 The possibility of regarding the forms לֶקַח, אֹכֶל and יוֹלֵד as nouns of this formation is suggested by Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 62 and *Opusc.* 351). See also above, note 142.

443 These two forms are derived, according to the modern grammarians, from the singulars סֻבָּל and סֻבָּךְ, in which the original U-sound is restored and, in turn, influences the cognate sound ב to take Dagesh and, in the case of סֻבֳּלוֹ, Ḥaṭef-Ḳameṣ, by the assimilation to the Ḳibbuṣ under the ס. Cf. Barth, § 74c and Ges.-K. § 93q. Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 332) reads, as in our text, סֻבֳּלוֹ, and he refers it to the פֹּעַל formation; while סֻבְּכוֹ may belong, in his opinion, to the same category as סְלָם, in which the Ḳameṣ was changed to Shewa as in מִקְדָּשׁוֹ La 5:7. But סֻבֳּלוֹ and סֻבְּכוֹ may be regular inflexions of סֹבֶל and סֹבֶךְ, with Ḥolem after the permanent vowel changed to Shewa; cf. below, note 469.

444 So in *Shorashim* 58 and *Riḳma* 61, but in *Riḳma* 60f. he suggests also that these forms may be taken as analogous to בֹּקֶר; namely, of the קֹטֶל (*ḳuṭl*) formation of the ל"ו stem, in which the Shureḳ has arisen as a result of the obscuration of the third radical. So also the modern grammarians; cf. Barth § 25b and Lagarde *Ue.* 144f.

445 The function of the termination ִי– in converting substantives

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

into adjectives, particularly in the case of the numerals and names of persons and countries, which are thereby changed into ordinals, patronymics and tribal names, respectively, is discussed in greater detail by Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*., chapter 21) and, among the modern grammarians, by Schneider (*Torath ha-Lashon*, Wilna 1925, chapter 79). Its use in the Semitic languages is elaborately treated by Barth §§ 217–227. On its relationship to the adjectival endings in the Aryan languages see Ewald § 164, note 4.

[446] On the grammatical and lexical explanation of this peculiar noun see Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 511) and Koenig II, 61f.

[446a] But in this instance, as well as below § 65c the Fürth edition (cf. pp. 175b and 202a) has the reading פֶּלְאִי; as in our text, which also omits the Dagesh in the פ. This reading is corroborated by the Masorah (see *Minhath Shai* ad loc.).

[447] Or rather instead of שֵׁנִי, with the initial Ḥireḳ changing to pretonic Ṣere upon the falling away of the final syllable, which Ṣere changes to Shewa when the accent is shifted forward, e. g. שְׁנִיִּים etc.; cf. below, note 549.

[448] The phenomenon of the change of ־ֵה to ־וֹן is also common in the corresponding forms in Arabic. Some grammarians assume therefore that they ought to be traced back to the more original endings in ־ָן and ־וֹן (Ewald § 163h; Olsh. § 215g; Stade § 296, remark 3; etc.). But Barth, loc. cit. § 224b rejects this assumption and explains the intervening of the Nun in these instances as due to the necessity of avoiding hiatus, i. e. the succession of the two vowels ־ָה or ־ֵה and ־ִי.

[449] Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 499) likewise derives it from שרד. Its origin and etymology are still disputed by the moderns; cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v.

[450] So previously Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 23 and *Riḳ*. 69). Some of the modern grammarians also hold this view (Stade § 301; Koenig II, 119; etc.). It is strange that Ḳimḥi should have overlooked this etymology found both in *Riḳma* and *Shorashim* by Ibn Janaḥ. In the latter work Ibn Janaḥ explains this word explicitly as a perverted person: האדם החולק, כלומר הנוטה מן הישרה. Joseph Ḳimḥi's interpretation נָסוֹג אָחוֹר is probably to be understood in the same sense.

[450a] This is another case of inconsistent reading by Kimḥi. In both the Lyk and the Fürth editions the reading עֻלְפֶּה is given in one place (Lyk 159b and Fürth 178b) and עֻלְפָּה in another place (Lyk 62a and Fürth 68b). Cf. also above, notes 232, 294a, 387 and 446a; also below § 53h and 583a.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

C. FEMININE NOUNS

§ 52. Formations with Changeable Vowels

IV. FEMININE NOUNS

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Sing. absolute	מַלְכָּה (queen)	[a] כִּלְיָה (kidney)	חֶרְפָּה (reproach)	[d] חָכְמָה (wisdom)	[f] צְדָקָה (righteousness)	זְעָקָה (cry)
Sing. construct	מַלְכַּת		חֶרְפַּת	חָכְמַת	[g] צִדְקַת	זַעֲקַת
Sing. with light suff.	מַלְכָּתִי		חֶרְפָּתִי	חָכְמָתִי	צִדְקָתִי	זַעֲקָתִי
Sing. with grave suff.	מַלְכַּתְכֶם		חֶרְפַּתְכֶם	חָכְמַתְכֶם	צִדְקַתְכֶם	זַעֲקַתְכֶם
Plur. absolute	מְלָכוֹת	[b] כְּלָיוֹת	חֲרָפוֹת	[e] (חֳרָבוֹת) [i] חָכְמוֹת	צְדָקוֹת	זְעָקוֹת
Plur. construct	מַלְכוֹת	[c] כִּלְיוֹת	חֶרְפוֹת	חָכְמוֹת	צִדְקוֹת	זַעֲקוֹת
Plur. suff.	מַלְכוֹתַי	כִּלְיוֹתַי			צִדְקוֹתַי	

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

a. a]. In some nouns, particularly with an initial laryngeal, the first radical takes Pathaḥ or Segol, e. g. שֶׁאֱלָתִי ,חֶלְקָה ,שַׁלְוָה ,שַׁלְמָה ,כַּבְשָׂה Lv 14:10, רַחְצָה ,אַהֲבָה Jb 6:8,[451] אֶמְרָתוֹ La 2:17 (but also אִמְרָתוֹ Ps 147:15 and אִמְרַת Pr 30:5), etc.

b. b]. Some of these occur also with the masc. plur. ending ־ִים, e. g. פִּשְׁתִּים from פִּשְׁתָּה and חִטִּים from חִטָּה (חִנְטָה). The form וּפִשְׁתִּי Hos 2:7.11 (for וּפִשְׁתָּתִי) is analogous to שִׂכּוֹ La 2:6, בְּסֻכֹּה Ps 27:5 and כִּתְבוּנָם Hos 13:2 (for סֻכָּתוֹ and תְּבוּנָתָם).[a]

c. c]. To the same paradigm belong also the forms מֵרִאשֹׁתֵיכֶם Ez 36:11[453] and הַקְּרִיּוֹת Jr 48:41 (for קְרָיוֹת, with Dagesh in the Yod to compensate for the long Ḳameṣ).[454]

d. *Rem.* 1. The form מִנְחָה is also of this class, the stem being מנח as evidenced by the mishnic plur. מְנָחוֹת; for if the stem were נחה and the מ preformed, the plur. would then be מִנְחוֹת, like מִצְוֹת and מַרְאוֹת.[455]

e. *Rem.* 2. The sing. abs. of יַעֲלַת Pr 8:19 and יְעֵלִים Ps 104:18 is יְעֵלָה, on the analogy of לִבְנַת Ex 24:10 and לְבֵנִים from לְבֵנָה, according to Jacob ben El'azar [cf. above, note 83], and not יַעֲלָה as employed by the Paytanim. Rabbi Isaac Benveniste [on his identity cf. Graetz, Gesch. VI, 405; VII, 21, 26], however, in his defence of the Paytanim in this regard, adduces the analogy of יַעֲנָה Is 31:21 and יְעֵנִים La 4:3.[456]

f. d]. In the same category are included the forms:

a. This form, as well as the plur. פִּשְׁתִּים, may also be traced back to a sing. פִּשְׁתָּה, like לִבְנָה, in which the ה is rejected in the flexions.[452] In the Talmud the form פִּשְׁתָּן, פִּשְׁתָּנוֹ occurs [cf. B. Ḳamma 62b etc.].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

כָּתְנוֹת Ex 39:27 [but see below, note 469, also Koenig II, 175f.], טָמְאָה, חָפְשָׁה Lv 19:20, חָמְצָתוֹ Hos 7:4 (unless it is an Infinitive),[457] and מָחֳרָת with ת in place of ה and Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf shifted forward under the laryngeal.[458] In בָּאְשָׁה Jb 31:40, however, the middle laryngeal quiesces, leaving the Ḳameṣ preceding it unchanged. In הָלְאָה the Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf is changed to a long Ḳameṣ, as in שָׁמְרָה Ps 86:2.[459]

g. e] The form הֶעֲרָלוֹת Jos 5:3 belongs to another category.[460]

h. f]. This formation occurs also with Ḥaṭef-Ḳameṣ in the first radical, סֳעָרָה 2K 2:1.11 and חֳרָבוֹת Ez 13:4 (from חֳרָבָה, for the plur. of חָרְבָּה would be חָרְבּוֹת).

i. g]. In the follwing constructs the vowel under the second radical remains unchanged, probably for euphonic reasons: מְעָרוֹת Is 2:19, מְעָרַת Gn 23:9 and 2S 23:13, תְּעָלַת Is 36:2,[462] מְצָדוֹת Is 33:16, בִּמְצָדוֹת 1S 24:1, מְנָאוֹת Ne 12:44 and מְנָיוֹת ibid 13:10; also קְעָרוֹתָיו Ex 25:29.

j. h]. To this class belongs also מְרַאֲשׁוֹתֵי 1S 26:12.[463] On its double plural characteristics see above § 45j.

§ 53. Formations with One or More Unchangeable Vowels

a. In the following formations the vowels of the initial and middle consonants are unchangeable: 1. פַּעֲלָה: כַּפָּרָה, בַּקָּרָה, פֳּרָשָׁה, נֶאָצָה [So Ḥayyuj, *Moviye Matereali*, ed. Kokowzoff, Arabic Text, 201], בַּצָּרָה, e. g. כְּבַקָּרַת Ez 34:12, פֳּרָשַׁת Es 10:2, בַּצָּרוֹת Jr 14:1;[a] but also בַּלָּהוֹת

a. In the same sense is construed by some the form לְעִתּוֹת בַּצָּרָה Ps 9:10.[464]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Jb 24:17 (from בַּלָּהָה)[465] and מִדַּבְּרוֹתֶיךָ Dt 33:3 (from דַּבָּרָה).[466]

b. 2. פֶּעָלָה (analogous to the preceding with the change of Pathaḥ to Segol under the first radical on account of the Ḳameṣ in the following laryngeal [cf. above § 9h]): לֶהָבָה, בֶּהָלָה, נֶחָמָה, etc. e. g. נֶחָמָתִי Ps 119:50 וּבֶהָלוֹת Jr 15:8, נֶאָצוֹת Ne 9:18.26. But לַהֲבוֹת Ps 29:7 is analogous to בַּלְּהוֹת Jb 24:17 (which see above) [cf. also note 465 ad loc.]

c. 3. פְּעֵלָה: בְּרֵכָה, אֲבֵדָה, גְּזֵלָה, etc., e. g. אֲבֵדַת Dt 22:3, טְמֵאַת Ez 22:5.10, שְׁאֵלָתִי Es 5:7.8, נְבֵלָתִי Is 26:19, בְּרֵכַת Ne 3:15, בְּרֵכוֹת Ec 2:6, וַחֲצֵרוֹתַי 1Chr 28:6, וּתְאֵנֵיכֶם Am 4:9. There are, however, some exceptions (unless they be referred to a different formation) נִבְלַת Lv 5:2, נִבְלָתִי Dt 21:23, בֶּהֱמַת Nu 3:41.45, שֶׁאֱלָתִי Jb 6:8 [cf. above § 52a], לִבְנַת Ex 24:10. But the forms בְּהֶמְתָּם Nu 3:4.5 and בְּהֶמְתֶּךָ Dt 5:14 are derived from בְּהֶמֶת on the analogy of דְּבֶלֶת, as evidenced by the Dagesh in the ת.[467]

d. 4. פְּעוּלָה or פֵּעוּלָה: בְּכוֹרָה, חֲבוּרָה, כְּסוּחָה 1S 5:25.[468] בַּטֻּחוֹת Jb 12:6, רַתּוּקוֹת 1K 6:21, גִּדּוּפֹתָם Is 51:7, מִלֻּאַת Ex 28:17.

e. 5. פְּעוֹלָה: עֲבוֹדָה, בְּשׂוֹרָה, construct אֲגוֹרַת 1S 2:36.

f. 6. פְּעִילָה or פְּעִלָה: שְׁמִטָּה, שְׁנִינָה, pl. שְׂכִיּוֹת Is 2:16, גְּדִיּוֹתַיִךְ Cn 1:8, קְרִיּוֹת Jr 48:24 [cf. above, note 454].

g. 7. פְּעִלָה: צְפִיָּה, צִפִּיָּתֵנוּ La 4:17, עִלִּית Ju 1:15 (for עִלִּיּוֹת Jos 15:19, either from עִלִּיָּה or עִלִּית, with the Yod radical assimilated to the adjectival Yod, as in שְׁלִשִׁיָּה).

h. 8. פּוּעָלָה [פְּעָלָה]: דֻּמִיָּה Ps 65:2 [but see above § 40n].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

i. 9. פְּעָלָה or פְּעוּלָה: סְגֻלָּה, חֲתֻלָּתוֹ Jb 38:9; יְשׁוּעָה, עֲזוּבָה Is 6:2, בִּיצֻקָתוֹ 1K 7:24.

j. 10. פַּעֶלֶת: בַּצֶּרֶת, כַּפֹּרֶת and perhaps פָּרֹכֶת. The plur. forms are: כַּפֹּרוֹת, בַּצָּרוֹת;[469] but in the Talmud [Pirḳe d'R. Eli'ezer, chap. XLI] the plur. of פָּרֹכֶת is פָּרֹכִיּוֹת,[470] on the analogy of מַלְכִיּוֹת and תַּחְתִּיּוֹת. So also פַּרְפְּרִיּוֹת.[471]

k. 11. פּוֹעֲלָה: שׁוֹרֵקָה, תּוֹעֵבָה; plur. תּוֹעֵבוֹת Ez 8:6; construct st.: תּוֹעֲבַת Pr 11:1.20 and שׁוֹמְמוֹת Is 61:4; with suffixes: תּוֹעַבְתּוֹ, תּוֹעַבְתֶּךָ, etc. [on the Segolatization of these forms see above, notes 391 and 397] שׁוֹמְמוֹתֵינוּ Dn 9:18. But סוֹלְלוֹת Jr 32:24 and בּוֹגְדוֹת Ze 3:4 are plural forms of סוֹלְלָה and בּוֹגְדָה.

l. 12. פְּעָלָה: אֻרְוָה,[472] plur. אֻרָוֹת 2Chr 32:28 constr. st. אֻרְוֹת 1K 5:6, and in the Talmud חֻתָּלָה.[473]

§ 54. Segolate Nouns

a. The following nouns ending in ־ֶת have the tone on the penultima and remain unchanged in the construct st. In the singular the final ת takes Dagesh with the suffixes. They may be divided into the following categories:

b. 1. פְּעֶלֶת or פְּעֵלֶת: דְּבֶלֶת, תְּכֵלֶת, בְּרֶדֶת Is 32:19, שְׁחֵלֶת Ex 30:34; with suffixes שְׁכֶנְתָּהּ Ex 3:22 and חֲבֶרְתְּךָ Mal 2:14, also with Ḥireḳ under the middle radical, גְּבִרְתִּי Gn 16:8, גְּבִרְתָּהּ Is 24:2 [cf. above, note 469]. To the same type are to be traced the forms בְּהֶמְתִּי, יְבִמְתּוֹ, יְבִמְתֵּךְ, etc. [these are further instances of segolatization, cf. above, notes 397 and 469]. The plur. is עֲקָרוֹת, the construct st. עַקְרוֹת, with suffixes עַטְרוֹתָיו. The singular of אֲמָהוֹת Gn 31:33 and אַמְהוֹתֶיהָ Na 2:8 is אֲמֶהֶת, which has been changed for euphonic reasons, to אָמָה, with suffixes אֲמָתוֹ.[474]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

c. 2. פְּעֶלֶת: קְטֹרֶת, with suffixes: שְׁכָבְתּוֹ Nu 5:20, קְטָרְתִּי Ez 16:18, נְחֻשְׁתִּי La 3:7 [in our text נְחָשְׁתִּי].

d. 3. פַּעֶלֶת or פְּעֶלֶת: קָרַחַת, סַפַּחַת, בַּהֶרֶת, אַדֶּרֶת, אִגֶּרֶת, כִּנֶּרֶת, עֲגֶרֶת, אִגֶּלֶת; with suffixes: גַּחַלְתִּי 2S 14:7, בְּקָרַחְתּוֹ . . . בְּגַבַּחְתּוֹ Lv 13:42, plur. בֶּהָרוֹת, אַדָּרוֹת. (but אִגְּרוֹת 2Chr 30:1 and כִּנְרוֹת Jos 11:2 and 12:3); constr. st.: לַהֲבוֹת Ps 29:7 [cf. above, note 465]. The form קָרְחוֹת, גַּבְּחוֹת וּבְעַצְּבַת Pr 15:13 (with the Segol of the צ omitted in the singular construct) probably belongs to a different class, the Dagesh being euphonic.

e. 4. פְּעֹלֶת or פְּעֻלֶּת: כְּתֹנֶת, בַּקֹּרֶת; with suffixes, כְּתָנְתּוֹ Gn 37:23, כְּתָנְתִּי Cn 5:3; plur. כֻּתֳּנוֹת, בִּקֹּרוֹת, or with Ḥaṭef Ḳameṣ under the second radical, שִׁבֳּלִים Gn 51:5 (masc. pl. of שִׁבֹּלֶת). So also in the construct state and with suffixes, e. g. בְּכָתְּנוֹתָם Lv 10:5 (for בְּכָתֳּנוֹתָם, which is found in one authentic MS. [so in our text]). [Cf. above, note 469].

f. 5. פּוֹעֶלֶת: חוֹתֶמֶת Gn 38:25, יוֹתֶרֶת Lv 3:4; plur., כֹּתָרוֹת 1K 7:18.41.

g. 6. פְּעֶלֶת: כֻּסֶּמֶת Ex 9:32, קֻבַּעַת Is 51:17.22. The plural is כֻּסְּמִים Ez 4:9 or קֻבָּעוֹת. The sing. of כֻּסְּמִים may however, be כֻּסֶּם.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOTES: CHAPTER FOUR, C

451 Later (below § 53c), however, Ḳimḥi derives it from the singular שְׁאֵלָה. So also Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 130) and the modern grammarians.

452 Modern grammarians assume a singular פֶּשֶׁת alongside of פִּשְׁתָּה; cf. Stade § 187b; Koenig II, 161 f.; also *ZAW.*, XXIX, 223 in the Almanac. The plur. פִּשְׁתִּים may also be referred to the sing. פֵּשֶׁת and may be regarded as a survival of the original plur. form; cf. עֲשָׂרִים (Bauer-Leander 571).

453 So also the modern grammarians. Cf. Koenig II, 162 and Ges.-Buhl s. v.

454 According to Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 457) this is not of the same formation as the singular. Below § 53g Ḳimḥi likewise classifies it under the category of פְּעִילָה. So also the modern grammarians, who assume a secondary sing. form קְרִיָּה on the analogy of צְבִיָּה, alongside of צִבְיָה (proper noun); cf. Stade § 192b; Barth § 20c and Koenig II, 168. See also the mishnic בְּרִיָּה (sing.) and בְּרִיּוֹת (plur.). The masc. בְּכִי, like גְּדִי, may give rise, according to Barth § 79g, to a feminine בְּכִית or בְּכִיָּה. The former, being an abstract form will yield in concrete equivalents the feminines גְּדִיָּה and קְרִיָּה. It is also possible to conceive of the change of קְרָיוֹת (from קְרִיָּה) and בְּרָיוֹת (from בְּרִיָּה) to קְרִיּוֹת and בְּרִיּוֹת. This would be in consonance with Hebrew phonetics (see below, note 471), cf. also the mishnic plurals מַלְכָיוֹת and אוּמָנִיּוֹת for מַלְכֻיּוֹת and אוּמָנִיּוֹת, also the form לְוִיָּה for לְוִיָּה (=כְּהֻנָּה). Analogous phonetic changes are found also in Arabic, e. g. ***marmīyun*** and ***mardiyun*** for ***marmūyun*** and ***mardūyun***, passive participles of the ***maḳtul*** formation; cf. Brock. *GvG*. § 36β.

455 So also Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 266 and 296) and, generally, the modern grammarians. But Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik*. 13) objects to the accepted reading מְנָחוֹת in the Talmud and refers the noun to the stem נחה, the plural of which is to be read מְנָחוֹת.

456 Modern grammarians likewise assume a singular fem. יְעֵלָה, as if the sing. masc. were יֵעֶל. On the possibility of evolving a *ḳatl* (יֵעֶל) from a *ḳatil* (יָעֵל) form see above, notes 391 and 397.

457 It is construed as an Infinitive on the analogy of לְחֻמְלָה Ez 16:5 by Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 160) and by the moderns (cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v. and Bauer-Leander 348).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

458 Ḳimḥi, as was noted above, note 18, makes no clear distinction between Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf and Ḥaṭef-Ḳameṣ. According to Olsh. §§ 38c and 206c this form is in place of מָאֳחֶרֶת, the feminine of מָחָר for מָאֳחָר, with the earlier fem. ending ת— in place of ה—ָ. The form is thus a passive participle with virtual doubling of the ח on the analogy of מְאֻדָּם. The Ḳameṣ should therefore be a Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf. The traditional Sefardic pronunciation of this Ḳameṣ is, however, that of long Ḳameṣ. Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 105) derives this word from the stem מחר and takes it as a פָּעָל form, but Judah Halevi construes it probably as a combination of יום and אחר (quoted by Ibn Ezra in comment. to Ex 13:14); cf. the targumic יומחרא for יומא אחרא (see Jastrow s. v.). So also Ges. in *Thesaurus* s. v. Ewald § 220b considers מָחָר a contraction of מָאֳחָר. But Koenig II, 263, argues against the theory of contraction or obscuration of the א and takes it, with most of the ancient grammarians, as a פָּעָל form of the stem מחר, the fem. מָחֳרָת having evolved from מָחֲרָת (on the analogy of זִמְרָת, etc.) by the process of "Vocaltruebung" (vowel-lowering), in the same manner as אָחֳרֵי Dn 4:5 developed from אַחֲרֵי ibid 2:29.

459 On the etymology of הָלְאָה see Koenig II, 259. The final ה is probably ה *locale* as in שָׁמָּה, הֵנָּה, etc. On the reading of long Ḳameṣ under the שׁ in שָׁמְרָה by Ḳimḥi see above, note 19.

460 This is in place of עָרְלוֹת and belongs to this category. The Ḥaṭef-Pathaḥ under the ע may be due to the analogical influence of the frequently occurring plur. of עָרֵל (עֲרֵלִים); cf. Koenig II, 158.

461 This is the correct and regular plur. form of this category, since קָטְלָה is merely the fem. of קָטֹל and the change of this Ḥolem (=*Ḳibbuṣ*) to Ḥaṭef-Ḳameṣ in the plur. absolute is quite obvious. In חָכְמוֹת Pr 9:1, 14:1, etc. the ending וֹת–is not a plural but a singular afformative (cf. Barth § 259c and Koenig II, 158). The plur. חָכְמוֹת is, however, traditionally accepted.

462 The noun מְעָרָה is derived by the modern grammarians from the stem ערר, hence the permanence of the Ḳameṣ under the ע (cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v.). Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 269), however, refers it to the stem מער. In later Hebrew the tendency is to keep the newly-coined nouns of this formation unchangeable, perhaps on account of their Aramaic origin, e. g. הֲבָרָה, הֲנָאָה, סְבָרָה, דְּרָשָׁה, etc.

463 The מ is therefore a preposition, the form being רְאָשָׁה. So also Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 464) and Parḥon s. v. But Koenig II, 184 takes it in place of מְרַאֲשׁוֹתַי; cf. below § 58f.

464 So Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Saadia* 4). Ibn Ezra (comment. ad loc.)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

rejects this etymology as not fitting the context and regards the ב as a prefix. This is also borne out by the translation of the LXX. But some of the modern grammarians take בִּצָּרָה as a secondary form of בִּצֶּרֶת; cf. Barth § 59, note 1; also Koenig II, 179. The plur. form בַּצָּרוֹת clearly points to a singular בַּצָּרָה and not בִּצֶּרֶת (cf. below, note 469).

[465] All the unchangeable forms given here are to be traced to an intensive conjugation (Pi'el), while in בַּלָּהָה, לֶהָבָה (see below, b), יַבָּשָׁה, etc. the sharpening of the second radical is purely nominal and does not indicate relationship to the Pi'el (cf. Barth, *Nb.*, Intr. XI, note 1; also § 59, note 1 and § 93a), hence the Ḳameṣ in these nouns is changeable.

[466] But Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 104) assumes a singular דִּבְרָה on the analogy of זִמְרָה Ps 147:1.

[467] The same principle of segolatization which operates in the development of כֶּתֶף from כָּתֵף may also obtain here. See above, note 397. In all forms of this category the Segolate forms are the basis for the sing. inflexion, while the others constitute the model for the plural forms cf. below, note 469.

[468] Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Galui* 110) suggests this etymology. But Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 335) takes the כ as a preposition and traces this word to the stem סוח or סחה (cf. סְחִי La 3:45), in which case the form is analogous to תּוּעָה Is 32:6, the Shureḳ being in place of Ḥolem. So also Parḥon 44c f. Rashi ad loc. likewise connects it with סְחִי. So also the modern grammarians and commentators.

[469] The plural of קטלת) formations does not seem to be clearly established in Ḳimḥi's mind. As a rule, he builds these plurals consistently with the retention of the Ḥolem in the second radical, except when they occur otherwise in the Bible, as in the case of כָּתְּנוֹת (for כְּתֹנוֹת) and שִׁבֳּלִים (see below § 54e); cf. below §§ 54e, 58n, 66w'. His predecessors did not seem to have concerned themselves with this problem. Nor is there much light shed on it by modern grammarians. Yet these formations are widely used in the plural in talmudic Hebrew, and they are also in vogue in modern Hebrew, both in speech and in writing, without much regard for grammatical accuracy or consistency. Some clarification of guiding principles in the construction of these plurals is therefore essential.

As a matter of fact, the Ḥolem in these formations is of twofold origin. One type of Ḥolem evolved from a short *ŭ*, which passed into *ō* when the syllable was opened, cf. above § 9g; while the other type is derived from a long Semitic vowel, *ā* or *ū*. In the former case, the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ḥolem, when in an open unaccented syllable, is reduced to Shewa, e. g. כֻּתֳּנוֹת, שְׁבָלִים, מַחְלְקוֹת, and גֻּלְגְּלוֹת (cf. גֻּלְגְּלֹתָם Nu 1:2, etc.), respectively, from כֻּתֹּנֶת <*kutŭntu*, שִׁבֹּלֶת <*shubŭlt*, מַחְלֹקֶת <*maḥlŭḳtu* (cf. Barth § 168b), גֻּלְגֹּלֶת <*gulgŭltu* (cf. ibid. § 138, 3). See in this connection also צִפֳּרִים from צִפֹּר, אַרְמְנוֹת Am 3:9 from אַרְמוֹן (or אַרְמֹנֶת, so Koenig II, 203), the constr. אַשְׁכְּלוֹת (Stade § 317a) from אֶשְׁכֹּל (or אֶשְׁכֹּלֶת), קָדְקֳדוֹ from קָדְקֹד, יִשְׁמְרוּ from יִשְׁמֹר, etc. (ibid. § 94). The same rule applies also to short Ṣere; cf. above, note 429. In cases where the Ḥolem originates from a long Semitic vowel, the secondary shortened form is employed only in the singular, while in the plural the original form with the long vowel is retained. Thus, according to Brockelmann, *GvG.* I, 64, the original long vowel is always shortened in Hebrew when it is doubly closed (i. e. by two consonants). Hence, such forms as *asmūrt* and *gabīrt* gave rise, in the singular, to the shortened forms *ashmŭrt*>אַשְׁמֹרֶת and *gebirt*>גְּבֶרֶת by a process of segolatization (cf. above, notes 397 and 467), alongside of אַשְׁמוּרָה and גְּבִירָה. Ges.-Bergstrasser, however, (§ 23a) explains this shortening on the principle of early Semitics, which does not allow of a long vowel in a closed syllable. In any event the singular will, accordingly, yield אַשְׁמָרְתִּי, גְּבִרְתִּי, etc., while in the plural the long vowel will be retained; hence אַשְׁמוּרוֹת, גְּבִירוֹת, etc. So, therefore, נְחֹשֶׁת — נְחָשְׁתִּי, כְּתֹבֶת — כְּתָבְתִּי, שְׁלֹשֶׁת — שְׁלָשְׁתָּם, בֹּשֶׁת — בָּשְׁתִּי; but נְחוּשָׁה — נְחוּשׁוֹת, כְּתוּבָה — כְּתוּבוֹת, שְׁלוֹשָׁה — שְׁלוֹשִׁים, בּוּשָׁה — בּוּשׁוֹת etc.; cf. above, note 467. Nouns like שִׁכּוֹר, גִּבּוֹר, תִּינוֹק, etc. may have fem. forms שִׁכֹּרֶת, גִּבֹּרֶת, תִּינֹקֶת, (Yoma 82a, etc.) beside שִׁכּוֹרָה, גִּבּוֹרָה, תִּינוֹקָה; the latter serving as the basis for the plurals. This method of forming plurals of these formations seems to have become prevalent in talmudic Hebrew and extended also to nouns of the first category, where the Ḥolem originated from a short *ŭ*, and where in biblical Hebrew this Ḥolem is reduced to Shewa, e. g. תַּעֲרוּבוֹת, תַּרְעוּמוֹת, תַּרְנְגוּלוֹת, also מַחֲלוּקוֹת Yeb. 15b, etc., from תַּעֲרֹבֶת — תַּעֲרוּבָה, תַּרְעֹמֶת — תַּרְעוּמָה, תַּרְנְגֹלֶת — תַּרְנְגוּלָה, and מַחְלֹקֶת. A sing. formation תַּעֲרוּבֶת, תַּרְעוּמֶת, etc., assumed by Levy in his talmudic dictionary, is impossible. According to Barth § 59, note 1, קְטֻלֶּת forms are possible by the side of קְטֻלָּה in the Pi'el, just as we find עֲבוֹדָה and צְדָקָה in the Ḳal. The plurals might then follow the predominating plural formula קְטֻלּוֹת (cf. בַּצֹּרֶת-בַּצָּרוֹת, above, note 464), hence, בִּקֹּרֶת-בִּקֹּרוֹת. Cf. also below, note 527.

470 But the reading given by Levy and Jastrow is פָּרְכִיּוֹת, which is probably correct. Cf. the following note.

471 The reference is probably to Aboth III, 18, where the reading

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

פרפריות is found in some Mss. in place of פרפראות; cf. also Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 47). Levy s. v. reads the plural פַּרְפְּרִיּוֹת and the singular פַּרְפֶּרֶת. However, the change of Ḳameṣ to Ḥireḳ effected by the proximity of the Yod may find its analogies also in biblical Hebrew; cf. above, note 454. There is a general tendency in mishnic Hebrew to form plurals of nouns with the lengthened afformatives ־ִיּוֹת, ־ָיוֹת, ־ָאוֹת, e. g. אוֹת–אוֹתִיּוֹת, מִדְבָּר–מִדְבָּרִיּוֹת, פָּרָשָׁה–פָּרָשִׁיּוֹת, מַלְכוּת–מַלְכִיּוֹת (cf. below, note 531), מִשְׁנָה–מִשְׁנָיוֹת, מֶרְחָץ–מֶרְחֲצָאוֹת, גֻּלְגֹּלֶת–גֻּלְגָּלִיּוֹת Num. Rabbah 19 and Tanḥ. Ḥuḳḳ. 20. The interloping of the Yod in these instances may be due to the analogical influence of the ל"ה nouns; or to the influence of the adjectival endings ־ִית, ־ִיָּה, the latter form serving as a basis for the plurals; cf. below, note 475.

[472] So apparently Ibn Janaḥ (*op. cit.* 62), who regards it as a fem. of the פּוֹעַל formation. This is the only instance of this type in the Bible. Later grammarians, therefore, assume a singular form אֳרָוָה of the קְטָלָה formation; cf. de Balmes str. II; Ben Zeeb (*Shor*. s. v.); Koenig II, 165; Ges.-Buhl s. v., as well as modern Palestinian usage. The plural אֻרְוֹת is in place of אֳרָוֹת. The change of Ḥaṭef-Ḳameṣ to Ḳibbuṣ is effected under the influence of Syriac.

[473] Ḳimhi may have reference to מלא חותלה אסי' j. Keth. VIII, 32b, which is generally read חוֹתָלָה (Levy and Ben Yehuda s. v.). Jastrow s. v. חוֹתָל reads חותל, ר' אסי וכו' . . .

[474] According to Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 37) and Parḥon 4d אָמָה is for אָמְהָה, with the omission of the ה radical in the singular. Barth (*ZDMG*., XLI, 627f.) regards the interloping of the ה as due to the dissimilation of the labials מ and ו. So also Koenig II, 179. Cf. also in Aramaic אֲבָהָן and in Arabic *'abahāt* (fathers) and *'umahāt* (mothers), as well as mishnic Hebrew אִמָּהוֹת. The plural *amht* is also found in Ugaritic (Cf. Gordon, Ugaritic Grammar, 38).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

D. NOUNS WITH AFFORMATIVES AND THE TONE ON THE ULTIMA

§ 55. Nouns terminating in וּת— or ִית— which are unchangeable in the sing. flexions

a. In the plural of this category of nouns the ת usually changes to Yod; since the Yod, Taw and Hē are kindred letters and frequently interchange.[475]

b. 1. פַּעְלוּת or פְּעָלוּת: יַלְדוּת, סִכְלוּת; plur. מַלְכֻיוֹת Dn 8:22 and in Talmud אוּמָּנִיּוֹת[475a] [cf. above, note 454]. In עִקְּשׁוּת Pr 4:24 the Dagesh in the ק is euphonic. To this category belong also זֻלּוּת Ps 12:9 (for זֻלְלוּת), מַאַשְׁפּוֹת ibid 113:7,[476] אָחוֹת and חָמוֹת [on the explanation of these forms cf. below, note 565]. The form אַלְמָנוּת changes in the construct to אַלְמְנוּת 2S 20:3 on account of the additional suffix Nun [from the stem אלם].

c. 2. פְּעָלוּת: אֱיָלוּת Ps 22:20, פְּתַיּוּת Pr 9:13 (with sharpening of Yod instead of long Ḳameṣ [cf. above, note 394]).

d. 3. פְּעִילוּת: יְדִידוּת Jr 12:7 פְּקִדוּת ibid 37:13 הֲרִיסוּתֵךְ Is 49:19, עֲלִיצוּתָם Hab 3:14 וּכְלִמּוּת Jr 23:40 (with sharpening of the מ). The plur. of כְּרִיתוּת is formed on the analogy of masc. nouns, כְּרִיתֻתֶיהָ Jr 3:8.

e. 4. פַּעֲלוּת: בְּכֵבֵדוּת Ex 14:25 and with the doubling of the third radical חַכְלִילוּת Pr 23:9.

f. 5. פַּעְלְלִיּוּת: קוֹמְמִיּוּת Lv 26:13 (with the quiescing of the middle radical).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

g. 6. פָּעְלִית: תָּכְנִית Ez 28:12, בֹּרִית Jr 2:22 (for בָּרְרִית) [so Ibn Janah, *Shor.* 74 and Joseph Kimhi, *Zik.* 26], and perhaps also נָזִית (for נָזִית with Kameṣ ḥaṭuf under the נ), the long Kameṣ compensating for the missing Dagesh.[477]

h. 7. פַּעְלִית: תַּחְתִּית, אַחֲרִית, and with Hirek under the initial radical חִתִּית (for חִתְּתִית).

i. 8. פְּעֲלִית: רֵאשִׁית, שְׁאֵרִית (for רְאֵשִׁית) with quiescing of the א, or it may be analogous to אַחֲרִית.[478]

j. 9. פְּעִילִית: צַפִּיחִית Ex 16:31.

k. 10. פְּעִילִית: חֲמִישִׁית Gn 47:24. The form וַחֲמִשִׁתָיו Lv 5:24 which is construed by the Talmud [B. Kamma 65b] as plur. (חמישיות הרבה), has only one plur. characteristic (see above § 45j). It may also be traced to a masc. plur. חֲמִשִׁיתִים.[479]

l. 11. פְּעֲלוּלִית: שַׁעֲרוּרִית Jr 18:13.

m. 12. פְּעָלַנִית: אֲחוֹרַנִּית Gn 9:23, קְדֹרַנִּית Mal 3:14.

§ 56. Nouns with Terminations in Nun or Mem

a. 1. פִּעְלוֹן: שִׁלְטוֹן, זִכְרוֹן, אַחֲרוֹן, חֶסְרוֹן, רִאשׁוֹן (with quiescent א),[480] סִלּוֹן Ez 28:24 (for סִלְלוֹן), חִלּוֹן (for חִלְלוֹן); constr. st. בְּחַצְצוֹן Gn 14:7 בְּחַרְבוֹנֵי Ps 32:4;[481] plur. זִכְרֹנוֹת. אַרְמוֹן may also belong to this formation. The forms אַרְמְנוֹת Am 1:4 and אַרְמְנוֹתֶיהָ ibid. are either to be traced to a different formation, or have the Hatef Kameṣ (instead of Holem) of the מ reduced to Shewa, as in בְּכָתְּנוֹתָם Lv 10:5 (for בְּכָתֳּנוֹתָם [so in our text]). [See above § 54e and note 469].

b. 2. פִּעְלָן: פִּשְׁתָּן [talmudic], בִּנְיָן, רַעֲנָן, בִּיתָן (with quiescent Yod);[482] constr. בִּנְיַן, etc.; plur. חַרְצַנִּים Nu 6:4, וְרַעֲנַנִּים Ps 92:15, also כִּבְשָׁנוֹת in the Talmud [B. Kamma

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

82b], on the analogy of דָּרְבֹנוֹת Ec 12:11 from דָּרְבָן or דָּרְבוֹן (cf. below, c). The form מִגְדָּנוֹת Gn 24:53 (from מִגְדָּן) is regarded by some as a מִפְעָל formation, like מִשְׁמָרוֹת and מִשְׁכָּנוֹת.[483]

c. 3. פָּעְלָן or פֻּעְלָן: שֻׁלְחָן, קָרְבָּן; constr. קָרְבַּן Ne 10:35 and ibid 13:31; plur. קָרְבָּנוֹת and שֻׁלְחָנוֹת. A long Ḳameṣ in the initial syllable occurs in הַקָּרְבָן Ez 40:43.[484] הַדָּרְבָן 1S 13:21 (with Pathaḥ under the ב, according to Ben Asher and Ḳameṣ according to Ben Naftali) כְּדָּרְבֹנוֹת Ec 12:11 (of which the sing. is perhaps דָּרְבוֹן).

d. 4. פְּעָלוֹן: רְעָבוֹן Ps 37:19, פִּרָזוֹן; constr. and with suffixes רַעֲבוֹן Gn 42:19 and פִּרְזוֹנוֹ Ju 5:11.

e. 5. פִּעָלוֹן or פָּעָלוֹן: זִכָּרוֹן, דֵּרָאוֹן Is 66:24, שִׁבָּתוֹן, צִמָּאוֹן; constr. and with suffixes קִנְּמָן בְּ Ex 30:23, מִצַּוְּארוֹנַיִךְ (from the dual צַוְּארוֹנַיִם) Cn 4:9 [in our text מִצַּוְּרוֹנַיִךְ].

f. 6. פִּעְלוֹן (with Dagesh in the second radical); גִּבְּתוֹן 1K 15:27, שִׁכְּרוֹן Jos 15:11; קִמְּשׁוֹן Pr 24:31 and with adjectival Yod יִדְּעֹנִי Dt 18:11.

g. 7. פְּעַלוֹן: אֲבַדּוֹן, אֲבַדֹּה Pr 27:19 (with final ה in place of Nun), מְגִדּוֹן Za 12:11, אֲבִיּוֹנָה Ec 12:5 (from אֶבְיוֹן).[485]

h. 8. פְּעִילוֹן: יְשִׁימוֹן, שְׁפִיפוֹן, אֲמִינוֹן.

i. 9. פַּעֲלָן: גַּרְזֶן, which is referred by most grammarians to the stem גרז, נִגְרַזְתִּי Ps 31:23.[486]

j. 10. פִּיעָלוֹן: קִיקָיוֹן Jonah 4:6 (cf. קִיק in the Mishna, Shabb. II, 1).

k. 11. פְּעַלְתוֹן: עֲקַלָּתוֹן Is 27:1.

l. 12. פִּעְלוֹם: שִׁלְשׁוֹם, פִּתְאוֹם, פִּדְיוֹם, and perhaps also מְתוֹם (for מְתִיוֹם).[487]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

m. 13. פָּעְלָם or פָּעֳלָם: סָלְעָם Lv 11:32, אָמְנָם, יוֹמָם (from the ע"ו stem) and perhaps also דּוּמָם (with quiescent middle radical).[488]

§ 57. Nouns with one or two of the Radicals doubled

a. 1. פַּעְלָל: פִּרְחָח Jb 30:12, שַׁאֲנָן ibid 12:5 וְרַעֲנַן Dn 4:1 (with Pathaḥ under the Nun instead of Ḳameṣ). But וְשַׁאֲנַן Jr 30:10, 46:27 and Pr 1:33 are verbs in the perfect [cf. above, note 346].

b. 2. פַּעְלוּל: וְנַאֲפוּפֶיהָ Hos 2:4, גַּבְנֻנִּים Ps 68:16 (with sharpening of the final Nun), and שַׁבְּלוּל ibid 58:9 (with Dagesh in the 2nd radical).

c. 3. פְּעַלּוּל: חֲבַקּוּק.

d. 4. פְּעָלוֹל: נִיחוֹחַ, נִיצוֹץ Is 1:31.

e. 5. פַּעֲלִיל: בַּעֲלִיל Ps 12:7,[489] סַגְרִיר Pr 27:15, חַכְלִילִי Gn 49:12 (with adjectival Yod).

f. 6. פַּעְפּוּל: בַּקְבּוּק Jr 19:1, חַרְחוּר Dt 28:22 (related to חֲרֵרִים Jr 17:6).

g. 7. פְּעוֹפַל: הַקְּלוֹקֵל Nu 21:5.

h. 8. פַּעְפַּל: גַּלְגַּל, דַּרְדַּע, דַּרְדַּר Gn 3:18 חַתְחַת and in pause כַּגַּלְגָּל Ps 83:14.

i. 9. פַּעְפֹּל: כַּרְכֹּם Can 4:14, כַּרְכֹּב Ex 27:5.

j. 10. פָּעְפֹּל: קָדְקֹד Gn 49:26.

k. 11. פִּעְפַּל: בְּצִלְצַל Jb 40:31, קַעֲקַע Lv 19:28.

l. 12. פַּעְפִּיל: זַרְזִיף Ps 72:6.

m. 13. פְּעָפַל: צְלָצַל Dt 28:42 (with Pathaḥ in pause).

n. 14. פִּעְלַע: עִנְיַן, קִנְיַן, בִּנְיַן (acc. to Ḥayyuj, but see above § 56b).

o. 15. פַּעֲלוּלִיָה: שַׁעֲרוּרִיָּה Hos 6:10.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

p. 16. פְּעַלְעַל: יְרַקְרַק, עֲקַלְקַלּוֹת Ju 5:6, כַּחֲלַקְלַקּוֹת Jr 23:12, הֲפַכְפַּךְ Pr 21:8, and אֲדַמְדָּם (with Ḳameṣ in the final syllable), fem. אֲדַמְדֶּמֶת Lv 13:43.

q. 17. פְּעַלְעָל or פְּעַלְעֹל: אֲסַפְסֻף Nu 11:4, וּפְתַלְתֹּל Dt 32:5, פְּקַח קֹחַ [in our text פְּקַח־קוֹחַ] Is 61:1 (although written as two words it is to be construed as if it were one word), fem. שְׁחַרְחֹרֶת Cn 1:6.

r. 18. פְּעַלְעִיל: יְפֵהפִי, fem. יְפֵהפִיָּה; although it is divided orthographically [יְפֵה־פִיָּה Jr 46:20].[490]

s. 19. פְּעֻלָּה: חֲצֹצְרָה Hos 5:8 חֲצוֹצְרוֹת Nu 10:2.

NOTES: CHAPTER FOUR, D

[475] Cf. Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 46f. and 49). On the development of these afformatives and on the extent to which they are employed in other Semitic languages see Barth 401–4 and 411–16; also Stade § 304; Koenig II, 203ff. According to some of the moderns the afformative ִית— (excepting the ל"ה forms like בְּכִית, etc.) arises from the addition of the feminine ת to the ending ִי— which is employed in forming adjectives, patronymics, ordinals, etc. (cf. Ges.-K. § 95t). In the plural, where the afformatives ִית— and ות— are resolved, these nouns probably follow, by false analogy, the example of the ל"ה nouns with the same ending; cf. below, note 575. Barth's view, generally accepted by the moderns, which traces the development of these formations to the analogical influence of similar formations in the ל"י stem, in which the Waw and Yod terminations are radicals, is disputed by Eitan (*AJSL.*, XLV, 58ff. and 131ff.). Eitan maintains that these formations represent respectively the original fem. *i*-afformatives (cf. the Arabic fem. afformative =ى and the Hebrew feminine names נָעֳמִי, כָּזְבִּי and שְׁלֹמִי Nu 34:27 [also 2nd per. fem. in the Perfect and Imperfect]), and the abstract and fem. *u*-afformatives regularly found in the absol. state in the older Aramaic dialects. The ת is therefore, according to him, primarily a binding consonant (cf. above, note 305), inserted only before suffixes, but it was later retained also in the absolutes by a process of backward formation. It may also be interesting to note in this connection the fem. *ai* ending in a few nouns in Syriac (see Noeldeke, *Syr. Gr.* 83), as well as the ending *i* and *a*, employed early in the history of the Aryan languages to characterize the feminine; see Jespersen, *Language*, pp. 394 and 402; also Koenig, *ZAW*., 1934, 149ff.

[475a] The traditional pronunciation of this word with Shureḳ in the first syllable is probably incorrect, as is also the case in the traditional reading of חוּמָּשִׁים in reference to the books of the Pentateuch. The basic forms in these two instances are אֹמֶן (cf. above § 51b) and חֹמֶשׁ. The inflected forms should therefore be אָמְנִיּוֹת and חֳמָשִׁים (cf. חֹדֶשׁ–חֳדָשִׁים). The Waw in the first syllable was merely intended to indicate the Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf (cf. above, note 48) and the Ḥaṭef Ḳameṣ, respectively. The Masoretes as well as the medieval grammarians, made no distinction between Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf and Ḥaṭef Ḳameṣ (cf. above, note 18). As a matter of fact, Levita lists 31 cases in the Bible in which a Waw

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

is employed to denote Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf or Ḥaṭef Ḳameṣ (*Massoreth ha-Massoreth*, 182 f.).

[476] So also Ibn Ezra (comment. ad loc.) and the modern grammarians. The latter, however, regard the א as a preformative (cf. Stade § 257; Koenig II, 152; also Ges.-Buhl s. v.)

[477] In *Shor*. s. v. זון Ḳimḥi reads זָוִית. So previously Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 69), who also derives it from זון. Barth § 127d refers it to the stem זוה, but Pinsker (*Mabo* 17, remark 2) found in the Babylonian MSS. the reading זוית (=זָוִית). He therefore concludes that the proper reading is זָוִית (from the stem זון), with Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf, and not with long Ḳameṣ, under the ז.

[478] ראשית is thus in place of רֵאשִׁית. The same is maintained by Barth, *Or. Studien* (Theodor Noeldeke) 788.

[479] Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 169 and *Shor*. 161) suggests that it may be construed as plural in form only, but not in meaning, like the plural forms of אַחֲרָיו, צַוָּארָיו, etc.; although he also cites the talmudic interpretation and regards it as plausible. The moderns, however, read here וַחֲמִשִּׁיתוֹ.

[480] So Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 67). Olsh. 406 and Stade § 111 regard ראשון as a contraction of ראישון (cf. Jb 15:7); while according to Barth § 207 and Intr. XXIX, it evolved from ראשון (ראש+ון) by dissimilation. Lagarde *Ue*. 195 and Koenig II, 225 refer it to the category of אַחֲרוֹן and קַדְמוֹן.

[481] But the modern grammarians refer it to the פַּעְלוֹן formation; cf. Koenig II, 129. Our text reads חַרְבוֹנֵי, without Dagesh in the ב.

[482] In like manner, Menaḥem 69, Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 63) and Ibn Ezra (comment. to Es 1:5) connect this word with בַּיִת. So also some of the moderns.

[483] So Menaḥem 53. Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 253), however, refers it to the stem מגר, although he admits the possibility of its being of the מִפְעָל formation. Modern grammarians generally derive it from the stem מגר; cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v.

[484] But Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 456) reads this as Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf. So also the modern grammarians, who likewise read the Ḳameṣ in דָּרְבָן as ḥaṭuf (hurried), despite the Metheg following it; cf. Koenig I, 99 and II, 101; also Ges.-K. § 9v.

[485] According to Dunash Ibn Tamim, quoted by Ibn Ezra ad loc. this is a diminutive form of אֲבִיּוֹנָה. Ibn Ezra, however, rejects this opinion. Koenig II, 203 explains this form as a variant of אֶבְיוֹנָה, the change in the vowels pointing to a difference in meaning.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[486] Cf. Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 102), who connects it also with the Arabic *karzin*. Barth § 209 does not, however, admit this possibility, on the ground that some Cdd. read נִגְרַזְתִּי and that the Arabic words *karzin* and *karzan* are also of foreign origin. The relationship between נִגְרַזְתִּי and גַּרְזֶן was already observed by Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Menaḥem* 57).

[487] So Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 277f.). Koenig II, 98 traces it to the ע"ע stem, the form being originally מְתָם, which changed to מְתֹם under the analogical influence of the frequently used תֹּם. The change from קָטָל to קְטֹל formations is not, however, uncommon in Hebrew; cf. above, notes 404 and 415.

[488] The ending ־ָם which is taken by some of the modern grammarians as adverbial accusative (Koenig II, 255 and others) was already recognized as such by Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 25f.). It is, however, regarded as a pure nominal ending by others (Ewald § 204b, Olsh. 421 and Stade § 293). In דוּמָם Barth § 216b sees a participle of the ע"ו on the analogy of שׁוֹבָב, with Ḥolem changed to Shureḳ on account of the following Mem. Brockelmann (*Sem. Sprachw.* 115f.) regards such examples as instances of mīmation, common in the Semitic languages as a sign of the Indeterminate.

[489] Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 368) refers it either to the stem בעל in the sense of *master*, or to עלל in the meaning of *superior*. Ibn Ezra (commentary ad loc.) accepts the former etymology and interpretation. Joseph Ḳimḥi (quoted by David Ḳimḥi in *Shor.* s. v. עלל) derives it from the stem עלה in the sense of עֱלִי Pr 27:22. Cf. also b. Rosh ha-Shanah 21b, where the interpretation *obviously* or *clearly* is offered (לישנא דמגלי). Modern grammarians and lexicographers generally regard the ב as a preposition; cf. Koenig II, 144 and Ges.-Buhl s. v.

[490] So Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 66), who adds furthermore that it is this division which prevented the change of the third radical ה to Yod, the correct form being יְפֵיפִיָּה (cf. יפיפיות b. Ta'an. 31a and Meg. 15a). Cf. also Barth § 14k and Ges.-K. § 84[b]n. The correct form of the sing. is not יפהפי as given by Ḳimḥi, but probably יְפֵיפֶה (cf. יפיפין b. Nedarim 20b), or יְפֵיפִיָּה. See also above, note 354.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

E. NOUNS WITH PREFORMATIVES

§ 58. Nouns with preformed מ

a. 1. מַפְעִיל: מַשְׂכִּים Hos 6:4, מַכְבִּיר Jb 36:31, לְמַשְׁחִית Dn 10:8; with fem. ending ־ָה: מַנְגִּינָתָם, מַנְגִּינָה La 3:63, מִצְּעִירָה Dn 8:9 (with Ḥireḳ under the preformative and euphonic Dagesh in the צ).[491]

b. 2. מִפְעָל: מִבְטָח, מִשְׁפָּט; constr. st. מִבְטַח Pr 14:26; but the Ḳameṣ is sometimes retained in the constr. st., particularly in nouns of the ל״א stem e. g. מִבְטָח בּוֹגֵד Pr 25:19 [in our text מִבְטַח] מִקְרָא־קֹדֶשׁ Lv 23:7; while it is occasionally changed to Pathaḥ even in the absolute st., cf. מִשְׁפַּט Lv 24:22, also in pause מֶלְצַר Dn 1:16 and מַחֲבַת Lv 7:9. In מִדְבַּרָה Jos 18:12 and 1K 19:15, the Pathaḥ of the const. st. is retained although it bears the tone, while in מִזְרְחָה Dt 4:41 the vowel of the ר is rejected altogether. In the plur. and with suffixes, the Ḳameṣ is retained only when it is pretonic, e. g. מִשְׁכָּנוֹת Ps 132:5, מִשְׁמָרוֹת Ne 13:30, מִשְׁקָלוֹ Gn 24:22, מִקְדָּשְׁךָ Dn 9:17,[a] מִבְצָרֶיךָ Hos 10:14, מִבְצָרָיו La 2:5, בְּמִבְטָחַיִךְ Jr 2:37; but מִבְצְרֵיכֶם מִבְצְרֵיהֶם, וּמִשְׁכְּנוֹתָיו Jb 39:6, etc.

c. 3. מַפְעֵל or מִפְעַל: מִפְעַל, מַטְעַם, מַשְׁאַב, מִשְׂגָּב; with suffixes: מִשְׂגַּבִּי 2S 22:3, מִבְטַחוֹ Jr 17:7 (with virtual doubling of the ח), מִבְטָחָה Pr 21:23, מִבְטָחָם Jr 48:13 (on the Segol instead

a. But in מִקְדְּשׁוֹ Nu 18:29 the Ḳameṣ is reduced to Shewa, perhaps, in order to differentiate between *it*, in reference to a hallowed part, and the other instances of מִקְדָּשׁ, having reference to the place of the sanctuary [So also Koenig II, 97; cf. also Haupt's Bible ad loc.].

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

of Pathaḥ cf. supra §§ 9h and 27b[c]); plur. מַרְבַדִּים Pr 7:16, מַשְׁאַבִּים Ju 5:11, מִשְׁמַנֵּי Gn 27:28, מַשְׁמַנֵּיהֶם Ps 78:31, מַנְעַמֵּיהֶם ibid 141:4. The reading of מַאֲוַיֵּי Ps 140:9 (from מַאֲוַי), without Dagesh in the Yod, mentioned by Ibn Janaḥ, is supported, to my knowledge, only by one Jer. MS. extant in Saragusta, in which there is also a Ḳameṣ under the Waw.[492] Ibn Janaḥ always bases his readings on this MS.

d. 4. מַפְעֵל or מִפְעֵל: מִסְכֵּן, מַפְתֵּחַ, מַשְׁבֵּר. In the constr. st. the first syllable takes Ḥireḳ and the second — Pathaḥ, e. g. מִזְבַּח Ex 20:24, מִרְזַח Am 6:7, מִשְׁעַן Is 3:1, וּמִפְתַּח Pr 8:6 (but מַפְתֵּחַ בֵּית דָּוִד Is 22:22, in order to indicate a difference in meaning).[493] In the plur. and with suffixes the vowel of the middle radical is reduced to Shewa, e. g. מִזְבְּחוֹת Hos 8:11, מִסְכְּנוֹת Ex 1:11 מַעְבְּרוֹת Jos 2:7, מִזְבְּחִי Ex 20:26, מִזְבְּחֶךָ Dt 33:10, but in מִזְבַּחֲךָ 1K 8:31 and מִמַּעַשְׂרוֹ Lv 27:31 the Shewa changes to Pathaḥ on account of its being followed by Shewa or composite Shewa. In בְּמַקְהֵלִים Ps 26:12 the Ṣere is retained on account of the ה. Of the same formation is מַהְלְכִים Zc 3:7[494] and perhaps also מַקֵּל (but see above § 48a) and מִקְדְּשׁוֹ Nu 18:29 (but see above, b).

e. 5. מָפְעָל: מָשְׁחָתָם Lv 22:25.

f. 6. מִפְעַל or מִפְעָלָה: לִמְתָעֵב Is 49:7, 1Chr 12:15, וְלִמְכַסֶּה Is 23:18, מְקָרֶה Ec 10:18, plur. וּמְבַשְּׁלוֹת Ez 46:23, מְקַטְּרוֹת 2Chr 30:14, מְרַאֲשֹׁתָיו Gn 28:11 (from מְרַאֲשָׁה),[495] and perhaps also מְקַדְשֵׁיהֶם Ez 7:24 (from מְקַדֵּשׁ), with the Dagesh in the ד omitted.[496] A variant of this form is מְנַקִּיֹּתָיו Ex 25:29 (from מְנַקִּיָּה).

g. 7. מִפְעוֹל: מִזְמוֹר, מִבְחוֹר 2K 19:23. This form is

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

unchangeable, e. g. בְּמִשְׁקוֹל עֶשְׂרִים Ez 4:10, כְּמִשְׁלֹשׁ חֳדָשִׁים Gn 38:24 בְּמִקְצוֹעַ Ez 46:21 הַמִּקְצֹעֹת Ex 26:25, מִקְצֹעוֹת הֶחָצֵר Ez 46:22; but לִמְקֻצְעוֹת Ex 26:23 is derived from מְקֻצָּע.[497]

h. 8. מַפְעוּל: מַסְלוּל Is 35:8, מַנְעוּל Cn 5:5, מָצוּק 1S 14:5 (for מַיְצוּק or מַצְיוּק),[498] מַבּוּל (for מַנְבּוּל [but see below, note 508]; plur. בְּמַחֲלוּיִים 2Chr 24:25, בְּמַכְלֻלִים Ez 27:24 and perhaps also מַעֲרוּמֵּיהֶם 2Chr 28:15 (from מַעֲרוּם or מַעֲרוֹם) and וּמַטְמֻנֵי Is 45:3 (from מַטְמוֹן).

i. 9. מִפְעָלוֹן: הַמִּסְדְּרוֹנָה Ju 3:23 (from מִסְדְּרוֹן).

j. 10. מִפְעֲלוּת: מִסְכֵּנֻת Dt 8:9.

k. 11. מַפְעֵלָה: מַכְשֵׁלָה, מַשְׁעֵנָה, etc. It is unchangeable in its inflections, e. g. מַחֲרַשְׁתּוֹ 1S 13:20, מַהְפֵּכַת Is 13:19, and Dt 29:22.

l. 12. מִפְעָלָה. The Ḥireḳ of the preformative frequently interchanges with Pathaḥ or Segol, e. g. מִלְחָמָה, מַמְלָכָה, מַלְתָּחָה, מֶרְכָּבָה, מְלָאכָה (for מַלְאָכָה),[499] etc. The construct forms לְמֶמְשֶׁלֶת Nu 32:33, מַמְלֶכֶת, מִשְׁמֶרֶת, מִלְחֶמֶת Gn 1:16, מִשְׁפַּחַת 1Chr 6:39 are to be traced to an absolute of the same formation, which also takes the suffixes, e. g. מִשְׁפַּחְתִּי, מַמְלַכְתִּי, מִלְחַמְתִּי, etc. [These are further instances of segolalization, cf. above, notes 397 and 469]. Instances of such absolutes are מִלְחֶמֶת 1S 13: מִשְׁמֶרֶת Ex 12:6; cf. below. It is thus analogous to the participial form פּוֹקְדָה, which also has a secondary from פּוֹקֶדֶת as the basis for its inflections. The plural is מִלְחָמוֹת, constr. מַמְלְכוֹת Ps 68:33, מִלְחֲמוֹת Jr 3:1 (but מִשְׁפְּחוֹת קִרְיַת יְעָרִים 1Chr 2:53 [in our text מִשְׁפְּחֹת]), and also in the absolute st. לְמִשְׁפְּחוֹת לִבְנֵי קְהָת Jos 21:26 [so *Riḳ.* 17, but in our text: לְמִשְׁפְּחוֹת בְּנֵי ק׳] and לְמֶמְשְׁלוֹת Ps 136:8 (in some MSS. [so in our

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

text]). To the same category belong also the forms מַתָּנָה (for מַנְתָּנָה) and, with the third radical sharpened, מַהֲתַלּוֹת Is 30:10, מַעֲדַנּוֹת 1S 15:32, מַעֲשַׁקּוֹת Is 33:15.

m. 13. מִפְעֶלֶת: מִגְעֶרֶת, מַחְבֶּרֶת, מִרְקַחַת, and מוֹלֶדֶת Lv 18:9; in pause לְמִשְׁקָלֶת Is 28:17. It is inflected like the above מִפְעָלָה.

n. 14. מִפְעֶלֶת: מִשְׁקֶלֶת, מַחְגֶּרֶת, מַשְׂכֹּרֶת, מַכֹּלֶת (for מַאֲכֹלֶת) 1K 5:25, מָסֹרֶת (for מַאֲסֹרֶת) Ez 20:37;[500] with suffixes מִשְׁקָלְתּוֹ or מַשְׂכֻּרְתֶּךָ Gn 29:15, מַחֲלָקְתּוֹ 1Chr 27:2, וּמַלְכֻּדְתּוֹ Jb 18:10; plur. מִשְׁקָלוֹת, מַחֲגֹרוֹת [cf. above, note 469]. The form מִכְמַרְתּוֹ Hab 1:15 is derived from מִכְמֶרֶת.

•

§ 59. Nouns with Preformative ת

a. 1. תִּפְעֶלֶת or תִּפְעֶלֶת: תִּפְאֶרֶת, תִּלְבֹּשֶׁת.

b. 2. תִּפְעָלָה: תִּפְאָרָה, תִּשְׁבָּחָה; pl. תִּשְׁבָּחוֹת.

c. 3. תַּפְעוּלָה: וְתַעֲלוּמָהּ Jb 28:11 (with euphonic Mappik in the ה as in גֻלָּהּ Zc 4:2, כְּבִכּוּרָהּ Is 28:4, גֻשְׁמָהּ Ez 22:24);[500a] plur. וְתַעֲצֻמוֹת Ps 68:36, תַּנְחוּמוֹת Jb 15:11, תַּלְאֻבוֹת Hos 13:5, תַּחֲנוּנוֹתַי Ps 86:6.

d. 4. תַּפְעוּל: תַּעֲנוּג, plur. תַּעֲנוּגִים Cn 7:7, תַּמְרֻקֵיהֶן Es 2:3, תַּחֲלֻאֵי Jr 14:18, תַּחֲלֻאֶיהָ Dt 29:31.

e. 5. תַּפְעֵל: תַּשְׁבֵּץ Ex 28:4 and in the Talmud תַּרְבֵּץ [B. Bathra 98b]

f. 6. תַּפְעִיל: תַּרְשִׁישׁ, תַּכְרִיךְ, תַּלְמִיד.

g. 7. תַּפְעְלוֹנִי: תַּחְכְּמוֹנִי 2S 23:8.

h. 8. תַּפְעֵלָה: תַּרְדֵּמָה, תַּבְעֵרָה.

i. 9. תַּפְעִלָּה: תַּאֲנִיָּה וַאֲנִיָּה Is 29:2.[501]

j. 10. תִּפְעַל: תִּדְהָר Is 41:19, תִּדְעָל Gn 14:1,[501a] תַּחְמָס Lv 11:16.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

k. 11. תִּפְעוּל: תְּבַלֻּל Lv 21:20, וּתְאַשּׁוּר Is 41:19.

l. 12. תִּפְעָל: תְּלַשָּׂר Is 37:12.

m. 13. תְּפוּעָלַל (with quiescent middle radical); וּבִתְקוֹמְמֶיךָ Ps 139:21 [but see above § 37v].

§ 60. Nouns with Other Preformatives

a. 1. נַפְעוּל: נַפְתּוּל; plur. construct נַפְתּוּלֵי Gn 30:8.

b. 2. נִפְעוֹל: נִמְרוֹד, and with Segol under the Nun: נֶפְתּוֹחַ Jos 15:15.

c. 3. יִפְעָל: יִצְחָק, יִפְתָּח, יִדְלָף, etc.

d. 4. יַפְעֹל: יַעֲקֹב.

e. 5. יַפְעוּל: יַלְקוּט.

f. 6. יַפְעֵל: יַעְזֵר.

g. 7. אֶפְעָל: אֶשְׁכָּר, אֶשְׁנָב, אֶצְבָּע [but see אֶצְבַּע Is 58:9], אֶשְׁפָּר. In the construct the Kameṣ changes to Pathaḥ, but in אַרְבַּע the ב has Pathaḥ even in pause. The plur. of אַשְׁמָן is אַשְׁמַנִּים Is 59:10.[502]

h. 8. אֶפְעוֹל: אֶגְרוֹף, אֶזְרוֹעַ, אֶפְרוֹחַ, אֶשְׁכֹּל, אֶתְמֹל (also with Shureḳ אֶתְמוּל Mi 2:8[503] and with Ḥireḳ under the א and Dagesh in the ת, אִתְּמוֹל 1S 10:11 [cf. Dunash, *Tesh. ag. Saadia* 49, and Ibn Janaḥ, *Shor.* 544]). The plural of אֶשְׁכֹּל is אַשְׁכֹּלוֹת Cn 7:8 and the construct is אֶשְׁכְּלוֹת ibid 9 and אַשְׁכְּלֹתֶיהָ Gn 40:10. Similarly אַרְמוֹנוֹת and construct אַרְמְנוֹת Am 1:4. These constructs may, however, be referred to another category, since the Ḥolem is not likely to change to Shewa [but see above, note 469].

i. 9. אַפְעֵל: אַבְנֵט, unchangeable in the flexions: אַבְנֵטְךָ Is 22:21, אַבְנֵטִים Ex 28:40. This noun may also belong to a quadriliteral stem [cf. below § 67g].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

j. 10. אֶפְעִיל: אַכְזִיב Mi 1:14 (cf. כְּזִיב Gn 38:5), אַרְגִּיעָה Pr 12:19 [with suffixed ָה],[504] and perhaps also of the same formation, אַתִּיק Ez 42:3 in place of אַנְתִּיק [so Ibn Janaḥ, *Riḳ*. 73 and *Shor*. 329].

k. 11. אֶפְעִיל: אֲבַטִּיחַ, pl. אֲבַטִּחִים Nu 11:5.

l. 12. אַפְעַל: אַפֶּדֶן or אַפַּדֶן, אַפַּדְנוֹ Dn 11:45 [probably rather from אַפֶּדֶן].[505]

m. 13. אַפִּלְעוֹן: אַפִּרְיוֹן Cn 3:9.[506]

n. 14. אֲפַעְלוֹן: אֲדַרְכּוֹן, plur. אֲדַרְכֹּנִים Ezr 8:27 and דַּרְכְּמֹנִים ibid 2:7.[506a]

o. 15. אֶפְעָלָה: אֶצְעָדָה, אַזְכָּרָה, אַזְכָּרָתָהּ Lv 2:9.

p. 16. אַפְעוּלָה: אַשְׁמוּרָה Ps 90:4, also אַשְׁמֹרֶת Ex 14:24 [cf. above, note 469].

q. 17. אַפְעֲלִיּוּת: אַכְזְרִיּוּת Pr 27:4.

r. 18. אֲפַעְפּוּעָה: אֲבַעְבּוּעָה, plur. אֲבַעְבֻּעֹת Ex 9:9, the stem being בעה (cf. נִבְעָה Is 30:13).

s. 19. הִפְעוֹל: הִנְדּוֹף Ps 68:3 and, with Shureḳ, הִתּוּךְ Ez 22:22 [but cf. above § 25j[a] and note 158].

t. 20. הַפְעָלָה: הַצָּלָה Es 4:14; הַכָּרָה, constr. הַכָּרַת Is 3:9 (for הַנְצָלָה and הַנְכָּרָה).

u. 21. הַפְעָלוּת: הַשְׁמָעוּת Ez 24:26.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOTES: CHAPTER FOUR, E

[491] Barth § 165 likewise regards the Mem as a preformative, although the Dagesh in the צ indicates that the Masoretes took it as a preposition. None of the other medieval grammarians seem to be distrubed by this peculiar form. Ibn Ezra (comment. ad loc.) interprets it as *small* (קְטַנָּה). So also Rashi (מוצערת ונבזית). Most of the modern grammarians construe the Mem as a preposition. Cf. also below, note 532.

[492] Cf. *Opusc.* 325. The same reading was also found by Norzi in an ancient MS. (cf. *Minḥath Shai* ad loc.).

[493] According to Stade § 272a the constructs מִקְטַל, where the absolutes are of the מִקְטָל formation, are probably to be derived from an absolute מַקְטָל. Koenig II, 105 likewise explains these as cases of interchange of מִקְטָל and מַקְטָל. See, however, Barth § 171cβ; also Grimme, *Grundzüge* 99f.

[494] The modern grammarians read here מְהַלְּכִים, or regard it as Hif'il with the weakening of the vowel under the second radical as in מַחְלְמִים Jr 29:8, מַעְזְרִים 2Chr 28:23, etc.; cf. Ges.-K. § 53 o, also above § 25h. On the possibility of construing it as plural of the pi'el (מְהַלֵּךְ) see above, note 278.

[495] Thus Ḳimḥi takes the Mem as a preformative and not, with Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 464) and Parḥon s. v. as a preposition. So also the modern grammarians. See also above § 52h and note 463.

[496] The modern grammarians read here מִקְדְּשֵׁיהֶם, although the possibility of reading it as a Pi'el participle is also admitted; cf. Ges.-K. § 93h. Ḥayyuj is likewise disturbed by the omission of the Dagesh in the ד and he compares it to תְּהַתֵלּוּ (for תְּהַתֵּלּוּ) Jr 9:4 (*Noviye Materiali*, ed. Kokowzoff [Arabic text], p. 46).

[497] Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 453) regards this as a case of metathesis, the Ḳibbuṣ under the ק representing the Ḥolem of the צ. This seems plausibe in view of the form מְקֻצְעוֹת in the next verse. But Stade § 318b regards it as Pu'al of קצע. Cf. also Ges.-Buhl s. v.

[498] Ḳimḥi derives this word, accordingly, from the stem צוק or יצק. Budde (comment. ad loc.) suggests here the reading מוּצָק (from יצק).

[499] So Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 237) and the moderns (cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v.); cf. also above, note 199a. This is also borne out by the vocalization

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

in the Babylonian system. Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 238) quotes also an etymology by some who regard the Mem as a radical and construe the word in the sense of the Arabic *milk* "possession".

[500] So the modern grammarians; cf. Ges.-K. § 23f. and Koenig II, 194. מַכֹּלֶת is taken also by Rashi ad loc. as connected with אכל, but מָסֹרֶת is construed by him in the sense of מסר. Cf. also above § 35c. f. In his etymology of מָסֹרֶת Ḳimḥi follows Ḥayyuj (N. 27).

[500a] In our text וְתַעֲלוּמָה is without Mappiḳ in the ה. In his commentary ad loc. Ḳimḥi suggests that נְשַׁמָּה may also be taken as a nominal form (נֹשֶׁם) with ה as pronominal suffix.

[501] These forms belong properly to the preceding category, with the phonetic changes entailed by their being of the לו״י stem. Cf. below, note 507.

[501a] Both in the Lyck and in the Fürth editions the forms תִּדְהָר and תִּדְעָל have pathah in the second syllable. In our text, however, they are both vocalized with Ḳameṣ. As regards תִּדְהָר Is 41:19, however, C. D. Ginsburg lists a number of MSS. and printed texts in which the *He* has pathaḥ.

[502] This is in consonance with Dunash's etymology (*Tesh. ag. Menaḥem* 93), who refers this word to the stem שמן. Menaḥem 35 explains it, probably after the Targum and Saadia, in the sense of מַחֲשַׁכִּים La 3:3 *darkness* or *graves*. Dunash's view is criticized and rejected by the Disciples of Menaḥem (*Tesh. ag. Dunash* I, 92f.), R. Tam (*Hakhr.* ad loc.), and Ibn Ezra (*Sefath Yether* 28). Joseph Ḳimḥi derives it from the stem אשם in the meaning of תֶּאְשַׁם שֹׁמְרוֹן Hos 14:1 (cf. David Ḳimḥi's comment. ad loc., but see *Galui* 55). Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 67 and *Shor.* 522) is rather inconsistent in that he regards the א, like Dunash, as a preformative, but he construes it in the sense of מַחֲשַׁכִּים. The moderns are equally at variance. Some derive it from שמן, others from אשם; see Ges.-Buhl s. v.

[503] But Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 544) construes this form as a conflation of אֵת and מול. This etymology was adopted by Ibn Bal'am (*Noviye Materiali*, ed. Kokowzoff [text], p. 131f.) and by some of the moderns; but see Koenig II, 265.

[504] In the Hebrew text, ed. Lyk, p. 167a Ḳimḥi reads here אַרְגִּיעַ. So also Ibn Janaḥ, *Riḳ.* 73. But in *Shor.* both read this word with the suffix ה ָ. So also Menaḥem 162. All of them take it as a substantive, like רֶגַע, although in *Shor.* s. v. Ḳimḥi explains it as an Imperfect Hif'il, with the subsequent לְשׁוֹן שָׁקֶר as the object. The majority of the modern grammarians likewise construe it as Imperfect Hif'il; cf. Ewald

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

§§ 228a and 337, 3d; Boett. II, 201[3]; Ges.-K. § 108h. But according to Barth § 86 this is a substantive, analogous formation of which occur also in Arabic.

[505] Koenig II, 100, after referring this word to the Persian *apadna*, emphasizes the tendency of these foreign words to segolatization in Hebrew; cf. פַּתְשֶׁגֶן Es 3:4, פִּילֶגֶשׁ, etc.

[506] Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 73) apparently reads אַפִּרְיוֹן and derives it from the stem פרה; cf. also *Shor*. 411. But the moderns connect it, after the LXX, with the Greek *poreion*; cf. Koenig II, 499 and Ges.-Buhl s. v.

[506a] Cf. Ibn Janaḥ, *Riḳ*. 74 and Koenig II, 499. But according to Torczyner, *Leshonenu* IX, p. 13, both these words are of Persian origin, the first corresponding to *Dareikoi* and the second to *drachmai*.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

F. NOUNS DERIVED FROM WEAK STEMS[507]

§ 61. Nouns of the פ״ן stem with First Radical Assimilated or Dropped

a. 1. מַעוּל: מַבּוּל, מַשּׂוֹר,[508] מַדּוּחַ; pl. מַדּוּחִים La 2:14.

b. 2. מַעָל: מַבָּט, מַטָּע, also with Pathaḥ under the middle radical, מַסַּע Dt 10:11 and Nu 10:2, מַסַּד 1K 7:9; constr. מַפַּל Am 8:6, מַפַּח Jb 11:20 (but also מַצָּב 1S 13:23 and מַתָּן Pr 18:16); with suffixes מַפָּצוֹ Ez 9:2, מַטָּעַי Is 60:21, מַתְּנָם Nu 18:11; plur. constr. מַפְּלֵי Jb 41:15. The form מַפֵּץ Jr 51:20 also belongs here.

c. 3. מַעָלָה or מַעֲלָה: מַפָּלָה Is 17:1, מַפֵּלָה ibid 23:13, מַתָּנָה, מַצֵּבָה; constr. מַפֶּלֶת Ju 14:8, מַצֶּבֶת Gn 35:14 (also מַצְּבַת 2K 3:2), probably from a secondary form of this formation (cf. supra § 58 l) on the analogy of מַ ֶק ֶב ת Ju 4:21, but also מַגֵּפַת Za 14:15 and מַסֵּכַת Is 30:22; plur. מַקָּבוֹת 1K 6:7, מַפָּלוֹת, מַטָּרוֹת.

d. 4. עִיל: שִׂיא and שִׂיג (for נָשִׂיא and נָשִׂיג), שִׂיאוֹ Jb 20:6, שִׂיג 1K 18:27.[509]

§ 62. Nouns of the פ״י Stem with First Radical Quiescent or Omitted

a. 1. מוֹעָל or מוּעָל: מוֹלָד, מוּסָר, מוּסָד Is 28:16; constr. לְמוֹרַשׁ ibid 14:23, מוּסַר ה׳ Pr 3:11; but מוֹצָא הַמַּיִם 2K 2:21 on account of the א; with suffixes מוֹשָׁבוֹ 1S 20:25, מוֹשָׁבָם Gn 10:30; plur. מוֹשָׁבִים, constr. מוֹשְׁבֵי Ez 34:13, מוֹרְדֵי Jb 24:13. Some grammarians, however, refer these constr.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

forms to a מוֹעֵל formation (cf. below), while the constr. pl. of מוֹעֵל is, in their opinion, on the analogy of מְוֹרָשֵׁי ibid 17:12, מְוֹצָאֵי Ps 65:9 and Ez 12:4.

b. 2. מוֹעֵל: מוֹעֵד, etc.; unchangeable in the sing. constr.; with suffixes מְוֹקְדָהּ Lv 6:2, מְוֹעֲדוֹ Nu 9:2, מְוֹפֶתְכֶם Ez 12:11, or מְוֹעַדְכֶם; plur. מְוֹפְתִים, מְוֹעֲדִים; constr. pl. מְוֹקְדֵי Is 33:14, מְוֹעֲדֵי Lv 23:2; with suffixes מְוֹפְתַי Ex 7:3, מְוֹעֲדָי Lv 23:2. The forms מְוֹעָדָיו Is 14:31 and מְוֹסֵרָי Ps 116:16 are referred by the grammarians to מוֹעָד [so Ibn Janaḥ, *Shor.* 198] and מוֹסָר, the Ḳameṣ ḳaṭan [Ṣere] replacing in the latter case the Ḳameṣ gadol.

c. 3. מְוֹעָלָה or מְוֹעֵלָה: מְוֹרָשָׁה, מְוֹעֵצָה, etc. It is inflected on the analogy of מִפְעָלָה (cf. above § 58 l), e. g. מוֹרֶשֶׁת גַּת Mi 1:14, מְוֹדַעְתָּנוּ Ru 3:2 (for מְוֹדַעְתֵּנוּ), מְוֹשָׁעוֹת Ps 68:21, מְוֹעֵצוֹת Jr 7:24, מְוֹסְרוֹת Jb 39:5, וּמִמְּוֹעֲצֹתֵיהֶם Pr 1:31. Of the same formation are מְוֹסָדָה Is 30:32, מְוֹסְדוֹת Ez 41:8 and מְוֹעָדָה Jos 20:9.

d. 4. מֵיעָל or מִיעָל: מֵיטָב, מִיכָל; const. מֵיטַב Ex 22:4 (but מִיכַל המים 2S 17:20); plur. מֵישָׁרִים Cn 1:4.

e. 5. מִיעוֹל: מִישׁוֹר.

f. 6. תֵּיעָל: תֵּימָן.

g. 7. תִּיעוֹל: תִּירוֹשׁ, תִּינוֹק (Talmud) of which the fem. is תִּינֹוֶקת and the plur. תִּינֹקוֹת [but see above, note 469].

h. 8. תּוֹעָל: תּוֹשָׁב Lv 25:35, constr. תּוֹשַׁב כֹּהֵן ibid 22:10.

i. 9. תְּוֹעָלָה: תְּוֹלָדָה, תְּוֹכָחָה. It is analogous in its inflexions to מִפְעָלָה (cf. above § 58 l). The form תְּוֹכֵחָה Hos 5:9 also belongs here, of which the plur. is תְּוֹכֵחוֹת Ps 149:7.

j. 10. עֵלָה: שֵׁנָה, עֵצָה, etc.; constr. שְׁנַת, עֲצַת; with

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

suffixes שְׁנָתִי, עֲצָתִי; plur. שָׁנוֹת, עֵצוֹת constr. שְׁנוֹת, עֲצוֹת; with suffixes שְׁנוֹתָיו, עֲצוֹתָיו.[a] The flexions of דֵּעָה are based on the secondary from דַּעַת. In צֵאָה (צֵאת Ez 4:12), and לֵהָה the Ṣere is unchangeable; in case of the former on account of the א [cf. זֵעַת Gn 3:19], in the latter-in order to prevent the close concurrence of the two homorganic letters [ד and ת].[510] The construct forms שְׁנַת לְעֵינַי Ps 132:4[510a] and חֲמַת לָמוֹ Ps 58:5 are due to their close connection with the prepositions following them (cf. below § 84b).

k. 11. עוֹלָה: צוֹאָה (for יְצוֹאָה on the analogy of בְּשׂוֹרָה), constr. צוֹאַת Is 4:4, with suffixes מִצֹּאָתוֹ Pr 30:12.

l. 12. עֵל: דֵּעִי Jb 36:3 (from דֵּעַ), צֵא Is 30:22.

m. 13. עוֹל or עוּל: הַצֹּאִים Za 3:4 (for יְצוֹאִים on the analogy of גְּדוֹלִים), בּוּל Jb 40:20, שׁוּעַ ibid 30:24.

n. 14. עֲלְעָל: הַצֶּאֱצָאִים Is 22:24, וְצֶאֱצָאֵי ibid 48:19 (from צֶאֱצָא).

§ 63. Nouns of the Stem ע"ו and ע"י

A. *Nouns composed of radicals only*

a. 1. פִּיל: שִׁיר, קִיר, צִיץ, etc. These are unchangeable in the constr. and with suffixes, with the exception of עִיר, the plural of which is עָרִים or עֲיָרִים Ju 10:4.[511] In צִצִּים 1K 6:29 the quiescent middle radical is assmilated to the final radical.[512]

a. The Paytan[509a] who employs the form וסבות לְעֵצוֹתָיו, for which he was criticised, had probably in mind the analogy of עֵדוֹתָיו Ps 119:2, but in the latter case the Ṣere is preserved to indicate its ע"ו stem [cf. below § 63c].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

b. 2. פַּ֫יִל:[513] בַּ֫יִת, חַ֫יִל, זַ֫יִת, etc. In the constr. and with suffixes the Yod quiesces, e. g. בֵּית ה' 1S 1:24,[a] בֵּיתוֹ, also שִׁיתוֹ Is 10:17 עִירֹה Gn 49:14. The plural forms are זֵיתִים, יֵינוֹת (Talmud, Keth. 65a), בָּתִּים,[514] עֲיָרִים Gn 32:16, חֲיָלִים 1K 15:20, עֲיָנוֹת Dt 8:7; constr. זֵיתֵי, חֵילֵי, בָּתֵּי, עֵינוֹת Ex 16:27 or עִינוֹת Pr 8:28 [in our text עֵינוֹת]. The plur. of עַ֫יִן is עֵינַ֫יִם. The form גֵּיא Dt 4:46 is probably of the same formation.

c. 3. פֵּל: אֵל, גֵּר, נֵר, etc.; unchangeable in the flexions. In נֵירִי 2S 22:29, אֵילֵי מוֹאָב Ex 15:15, רֵישָׁם Pr 10:15 the quiescent middle radical reappears and is changed to א in רֵאשֶׁךָ Pr 6:11.

d. 4. פָּל: זָר, רָשׁ, etc. In the constr. the Ḳameṣ changes to Pathaḥ, but is retained in all the other flexions,[b] e. g. זָרִים,[518] וְשָׂטֵי כָזָב Ps 40:5 רָעוֹת מַרְאֶה Gn 41:3.[519]

e. 5. פּוֹל or פּוּל: אוֹר, פּוּר, etc.: unchangeable in the inflections, even before a Maḳḳef, e. g. יוֹם־בְּשׂוֹרָה 2K 7:9, בְּאוֹר־פְּנֵי Pr 16:15. Exceptional forms are: שְׁוָרִים Hos 12:12 (from שׁוֹר), שְׁוָקִים Cn 3:2 (from שׁוּק), דְּוָדִים 2Chr 35:13 (from דּוּד), לְלִים 1K 6:8 (from לוּל or לוֹל on the analogy of אֲדָמִים from אָדֹם) [in our text לוּלִים], יָמִים (from יוֹם)

a. The constr. and abs. forms sometimes interchange, e. g. כְּיַ֫יִן הַטּוֹב Cn 7:10, בְּחֵיל כָּבֵד Is 36:2; but מִיַּ֫יִן הָרֶקַח Cn 8:2, יַ֫יִן תַּרְעֵלָה Ps 60:5, וְעַ֫יִר פֶּרֶא Jb 11:12.

b. There are also several instances of absolute forms in the constr. st. and vice versa, e. g. כְּעָב טַל Is 18:4, כְּעָב מַלְקוֹשׁ Pr 16:15, וְעָב עֵץ Ez 41:25,[515] בַּפַּשׁ Jb 35:15,[516] פַּח, חַח, עַד which becomes Segol in וָעֶד [on the explanation of this form see below § 64c note 536]. Similarly in צָר the Ḳameṣ and Pathaḥ interchange regardless of its syntactic state (there being 7 instances with Ḳameṣ according to the Masora).[517]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

and רָאשִׁים (from רֹאשׁ).[a] The form חֻר פֶּתֶן Is 11:8 may be the construct of חוֹר, on the analogy of מְצוּלוֹת יָם Mi 7:19 and Zc 10:11 from מְצוֹלוֹת Ex 15:5. So also perhaps טוּב הָאָרֶץ Is 1:19 from טוֹב, although we also find טוּב in the abs. st. (Dt 6:11) and טוֹב in the construct st. (Ez 31:16).

B. *Nouns with preformatives and afformatives*

f. 1. מְפוֹל or מָפוּל: מָקוֹם, מָצוּק 1S 14:5, etc.; they are inflected analagously to פָּעוֹל (cf. above § 49e). In מְשׁוֹטַיִךְ Ez 27:6 (from מְשׁוֹט = מָשׁוֹט ibid v. 29) the Dagesh compensates for the latent quiescent of the long Ḳameṣ. This form, as well as מֵרוֹץ Ec 9:11, is analogous to מִזְמוֹר מִגְדּוֹל 2S 22:51. [On the forms מְבָאֲךָ 2S 3:25 and מְבָאָיו Ez 43:11 see above § 36n and note 224.]

g. 2. פָּלוֹן: זָדוֹן Pr 11:2, לָצוֹן Is 28:14; inflected like מָפוֹל (cf. above, a).

h. 3. מוּפָל: מוּעָף, מוּצָק,[521] and with fem. suffix מוּעָקָה Ps 66:11.

i. 4. תּוּפָל: תּוּרַק Cn 1:3. The Pathaḥ in this formation is due to the analogy of the Imperfect Hof'al.

j. 5. פִּילוֹן: פִּישׁוֹן (from וּפִשְׁתֶּם Mal 3:20), גִּיחוֹן (from יָגִיחַ Jb 40:23), תִּיכוֹן,[522] etc. Of the same formation is זֵידוֹנִים Ps 124:5 (with Ṣere instead of Ḥireḳ).

k. 6. פֶּלֶת: בֹּשֶׁת Ps 44:16, נֹפֶת ibid 19:11 inflected like פֹּעַל (cf. above § 47).

a. The Ḳameṣ in רָאשִׁים, however, is unchangeable, while that in יָמִים changes to Shewa in the constr. and with grave suffixes (הַמִּן, כְּמוֹ), perhaps on the analogy of בִּכְתֳּנֹתָם Lv 10:5 (cf. above § 54e), where the Shewa is in place of Ḥaṭef Ḳameṣ, the derivative of the Ḥolem.[520]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

l. 7. פֵּילָם : רֵיקָם.

m. 8. פְּלְנָה : בָּשְׁנָה Hos 10:6.[523]

n. 9. In the following formations the initial vowel is unchangeable, while the fem. afformative ה changes to ת in the sing. with suffixes, which is preceded by Pathaḥ in the constr. st.

o. 1. פּוּלָה or פּוֹלָה : דּוּגָה Am 4:2, בּוּשָׁה, רוֹמָה Mi 2:3 שׁוֹאָה Pr 1:27.

p. 2. פֵּלָה : צֵדָה Gn 45:21, שֵׂיבָה Dt 32:26; pl. עֵדוֹת Dt 4:45. The form מְשֵׂיבוֹ 1K 14:4 is either for מְשֵׂיבָתוֹ, like וְצוּרָם Ps 49:15, or is derived from שֵׂיב.[524] A secondary formation of this type is פֶּלֶת : נֶחַת, שֵׁחַת (בְּשַׁחֲתָם Ez. 19:4.8 [in our text בְּשַׁחְתָּם]) and perhaps also זֶרֶת Ex 28:16.[525]

q. 3. פָּלָה : קָמָה Dt 23:26, עָלוֹת Is 40:11,[526] etc. In בָּמֳתֵי Is 14:14 and Am 4:13 (for בָּמוֹת Ez 16:16) both the masc. and fem. plur. characteristics concur, with the Ḥolem changed to Ḥaṭef Ḳameṣ for euphony.[527] To the same category may also belong the forms שָׁרוֹתֶיהָ Jr 5:10[528] and שָׁתוֹתֶיהָ Is 19:10;[529] but שְׁתוֹתֵיהֶם 2S 10:4, with Ḳameṣ changed to Shewa, is either exceptional or belongs to a formation of the ל״ה stem.

r. 4. פִּילָה : חִידָה, שִׂירָה; pl. שִׁירוֹת Am 8:3.

s. 5. פֵּלוּת : עֵדוּת Ex 39:35, גֵּרוּת Jr 41:17; with suffixes עֵדוֹתִי Ps 132:12, or it may be referred to a sing. עֵדוֹת;[530] plur. עֵדְיוֹת or עֵדוֹת, also עֵדְוֹת, with Waw sounded, (עֵדְוֹתֶיךָ Ps 119:14), in which the middle and final radicals interchange as in עַוְלָה and עַלְוָה.[531]

t. 6. תְּפוּלָה : תְּבוּנָה, etc.; plur. תְּשׁוּבוֹת (on וּתְפוֹצוֹתֵיכֶם Jr 25:34 cf. above § 37q). In בִּתְשׂוּמֶת יָד Lv 5:21 the Segol (Pathaḥ ḳaṭan) replaces the Pathaḥ. In כִּתְבוּנָם Hos 13:2

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the fem. characteristic is dropped as in מִדָּה Jb 11:9 (for מִדָּתָה), פִּנָּה Pr 7:8 (for פִּנָּתָה). Some grammarians [Joseph Ḳimḥi, *Zik*. 27], however, assume inflections in the sing. throughout without the fem. suffix ־ָה, e. g. תְּבוּנִי, פִּנִּי, מִדִּי etc. The form תְּאֻנִים Ez 24:12 is plur. of this formation. on the analogy of חִטִּים from חִטָּה [cf. Ibn Janaḥ, *Opusc.* 62 f.]

u. 7. מְפוּלָה: מְבוּכָה, מְצוּדָה Ec 9:12 [in our text מְצוֹדָה].

v. 8. מַמְפּוּלָה: מַמְּגֻרוֹת Jo 1:17.[532]

w. 9. הֲפָלָה: הֲנָחָה Ex 2:18. הֲנָפָה Is 30:28.

x. 10. הֲפוּלָה: הֲפֻגוֹת La 3:49.

y. 11. מְפָלָה: מְצָדוֹת Ez 19:9 (or from the stem מצד).[533]

§ 64. Nouns of the Stem ע"ע

A. *Formations composed of radicals only*

a. 1. פֹּל: תֹּם, עֹז, etc.; construct מִקֹּל זְנוּתָהּ Jr 3:9;[534] with suffixes, תֻּמִּי, עֻזִּי, etc. Of the same formation is also כֹּל, in which the Ḥolem changes to Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf before a Maḳḳef, except in two instances: כָּל עַצְמוֹתַי Ps 35:10 and כָּל אֲחֵי רָשׁ Pr 19:7., where the Ḳameṣ is not followed by a Maḳḳef and is, therefore, pronounced long [on the pronunciation of this Ḳameṣ see above, note 22]. In the 2nd pers. sing. fem., both כֻּלֵּךְ Is 22:1 and כֻּלֵּךְ ibid 14:29.31, occur. In the plur. 3rd pers., the plur. suffix הם–הן is uncontracted in כֻּלָּהֵם 2S 23:6 (for the usual כֻּלָּם), and in כֻּלָּהְנָה 1K 7:37 (for כֻּלָּן).

b. 2. פָּל or פַּל:[a] תָּם, דַּל, קַל, הַר, זַךְ. There is, however,

a. The formations with Ḳameṣ are on the analogy of פֹּעַל or פֹּעַל (with Ḳameṣ ḳaṭan in the first syllable), while those with Pathaḥ

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

no consistency in the vocalization, the Pathaḥ and the Ḳameṣ interchanging promiscuously in most of these nouns or adjectives, and each case has to be determined by the Masora. The Ḳameṣ in יָם and עָם changes to Pathaḥ in the construct, but is retained before a Maḳḳef even in the construct meaning, e. g. יָם־כִּנֶּרֶת Nu 34:11, יָם־הַמֶּלַח ibid 12 [without Maḳḳef in our text] הָעָם־הַזֶּה Ex 32:9 [in our text without Maḳḳef], but עַם ה׳ Nu 11:29. All cases of עָם with the definite article have Ḳameṣ. The plural is either with Pathaḥ or Ḥireḳ in the initial syllable, e. g. סַפּוֹת, רַבִּים 2S 17:28, also סִפִּים Is 6:4, סִפּוֹת כֶּסֶף 2K 12:14, כִּתִּים, etc.

c. 3. פֵּל: קֵן, שֵׁן, לֵב; before Maḳḳef שֶׁן־סֶלַע Jb 39:28, וְשֶׁן־בְּהֵמוֹת Dt 32:24, עֶת־נִדָּתָהּ Lv 15:25, but in לֵב the Ṣere changes to Segol only before a tone-syllable, e.g. לֶב־יָם Pr 20:19 לֶב־נַעַר ibid 22:15, but לֵב־דָּוִד 2S 24:10 and לֵב־פַּרְעֹה, Ex 14:4. The Ṣere of עֵד changes to Segol in עוֹלָם וָעֶד in order to differentiate it from הַיּוֹדֵעַ וָעֵד Jr 29:23 (of the stem ע״ו).[536] Of the same type are סֶלָה, הֶרָה Gn 14:10 with pleonastic ה.[537] The constr. form קַן־צִפּוֹר Dt 22:6 may be of a different formation [but see above, note 391]. In the plur. and with suffixes the Ṣere changes to Hireḳ.

B. *Nouns of the stem* ע"ע, *with preformatives and afformatives*

d. 1. מְפֵל: מָעֹז and מָחוֹל. The latter is inflected like מָפוֹל of the ע"ו verbs, and may belong to that category e. g. בְּמָחוֹל מְשַׂחֲקִים Jr 31:4, מְחֹלוֹת Ex 32:19, and, with fem.

belong to the פֶּעֶל class, the Segol being a Pathaḥ ḳaṭan.[535] The form אַף does not belong here, but is really derived from אָנַף [by backward formation], the Nun having assimilated in the inflexions.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

suffix כְּמְחוֹלַת Cn 7:1.[538] The Dagesh expected in the ל may, however, have been replaced by the preceding long vowel in order to differentiate this word from מְחִלּוֹת Is 2:19. מָעֹז is unchangeable in the construct, e. g. מָעוֹז פַּרְעֹה Is 30:2, with suffixes מָעֻזּוֹ ibid 17:9. In מָעֻזְנֶיהָ Is 23:11 the Nun is pleonastic, or may be in place of the missing radical.[539] On מְתוֹם ibid 1:6 see above § 561.

e. 2. מָפֵל : מָגֵן, construct מָגֵן שָׁאוּל 2S 1:21, with suffixes מָגִנֵּנוּ Ps 84:10.

f. 3. מָפָל : מָסָךְ Ex 39:40, cstr. מָסַךְ ibid 40:5.

g. 4. מֵפַל : מֵסַב 1K 6:29, מֵצַל Ez 31:3, מֵצַר Ps 118:5; it may be analogous to the מַפְעַל formation, with Pathaḥ in the second syllable in place of Ṣere.[539a]

h. 5. מֶפֶל : מֶכֶס Nu 31:28, מֶמֶר Pr 17:25, מֶשֶׁק Gn 15:2; it is analogous to מִפְעָל of the strong verbs.[540]

i. 6. מֶפֶל : מֹרֶךְ Lv 26:36, מֹעַל Ne 8:6; on the analogy of מָפְעָל, for מָרְכָּךְ and מָעְלָל, cf. מָשְׁחָת Mal 1:14.[541]

j. 7. מוּפָל or מוּפָל : מוּרָד 1K 7:29, cstr. מוּסַךְ 2K 16:18.

k. 8. מֵפַל : מֵשַׁק גֵּבִים Is 33:4.

l. 9. מְפִלָּה : מְגִלָּה, מְחִתָּה, מְגִנָּה, מְקֵרָה Ju 3:20. The form מִכְסַת Ex 12:4 is in place of מִכְסַּת on the analogy of מְגִנַּת La 3:65 [cf. above, note 540].

m. 10. תְּפִלָּה : תְּהִלָּה, תְּפִלָּה. The form תִּפְלָה Jb 24:12 (from פְּלִילִים Ex 21:22) is lightened in order to differentiate it from תְּפִלָּה Ps 90:1;[542] similarly תָּהֳלָה Jb 4:19 (from הוֹלֵלוֹת Ec 1:17 or יָהֵלּוּ Is 13:10) to distinguish it from תְּהִלָּה Ps 145:1.[543]

n. 11. תֶּפֶל : תֶּבֶל Lv 20:12, תֶּמֶס Ps 58:9.[544]

o. 12. הָפֵל : הָמָס, plur. הֲמָסִים Is 64:1 (for הֲמַסִּים).[545]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

p. 13. הַפְּלָה: הֲמֻלָּה Jr 11:16, associated in meaning with מִלָּה.

q. 14. פִּלָּה: בִּצָּה, גִּזָּה, perhaps also גֵּרָה; cstr. חִתַּת Gn 35:5.

r. 15. פַּלָּה: שַׁמָּה, קָרָה Jb 24:7.

s. 16. פְּלּוּת: זֻלּוּת, Ps 12:9b (cf. above § 55b).

t. 17. פֻּלָּה: סֻכָּה, חֻפָּה, also חָגָּא Is 19:17, and מָרַּת Pr 14:10 [in our text מָרַּת]. On סֻכֹּה Ps 27:5 see above § 52b.[a]

u. 18. פִּלָּם: חִנָּם Is 52:3.5 (from חָנַן Gn 33:5).

§ 65. Nouns of the Stem ל״א

a. These nouns are inflected like the corresponding nouns of the strong verbs.

b. a. פָּעָל: צָבָא, צָמָא, cf. above § 47a–d.

c. b. פֶּעֶל or פֵּעֶל: גֶּבֶא Is 30:14, פֶּלֶא, also פֶּלֶא Is 9:5 [in our text פֶּלֶא] with Yod relationis פְּלָאִי Ju 13:18 [in our text פִּלְאִי, see above, note 446a]. Of the same formation are חֵטְא and גֵּיא Is 40:4 or גֵּיא Zc 14:4, perhaps also גַּיְא Dt 3:29 (see also above § 47e'). The plur. forms חֲטָאַי 2K 10:29 and חֲטָאֵיכֶם Is 1:18 seem, however, to point to an intensive formation (with Dagesh in the third radical if it were not for the laryngeal א).[546] The plural גֵּאָיוֹת Ez 6:3 is either from גַּיְא or גֵּאָה, with ה or ת changed to Yod (cf. above § 55a).[547]

d. c. פֹּעֶל: גֹּמֶא Is 18:2, סָבְאָם Hos 4:18; plur. עֳפָאִים Ps 104:12.

e. d. פִּעֵל: כִּסֵּא, כִּסְאוֹת Ps 122:5.

a. The form בְּסֻכֹּה (=בְּסֻכּוֹ) may, however, also be derived from a sing. סֹךְ in the same sense [so Joseph Ḳimḥi, *Zik.* 27].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

f. e. פַּעָל: דַּכָּא Is 57:15, קַנָּא Ex 34:14; plur. חַטָּאַי Am 9:10, וְחַטָּאֶיהָ Is 13:9, but דַּכְּאֵי רוּחַ Ps 34:19 (perhaps from דַּכֵּא).

g. f. פַּעָל: קַנּא Na 1:2.

h. g. פָּעִיל: נְשִׂיא, קְרִיאֵי מוֹעֵד Nu 16:2.

i. h. פְּעִיל: מְרִיא [1K 1:9].

j. i. פְּעָל: מְלֹא Is 6:3, מְצֹא Ps 32:6.

k. j. פְּעָאת: לִקְרָאת Ex 19:17, לִקְרָאתֶךָ Ibid 4:14. [but לִקְרָאת is really a syncope of לִקְרֹאת, the fem. Infinitive of קרא; cf. Ges.-K. § 19k].

l. k. פַּעָאת: cstr. חַטַּאת Jr 17:1, חַטֹּאת אביו Ez 18:14.

m. l. פְּעֵאת: נִשֵּׂאת 2S 19:43, מִלֵּאת Can 5:12; unchangeable in the flexions [on these formations see above, note 296].

n. m. מַעָל: מַשָּׂא, unchangeable in the cstr. מַשָּׂא כָל יָד Ne 10:32.

o. n. מוֹעָל: מוֹרָא cf. above § 62a.

§ 66. Nouns of the Stem ל"ה

a. A.

(פָּעֶה) שָׂדֶה	שָׂדְךָ	פָּנִים [a]	שָׂדוֹת
cstr. שְׂדֵה	שָׂדוֹ or שָׂדֵהוּ	פְּנֵי [b]	שְׂדוֹת
שָׂדִי	שָׂדֶה	פָּנַי	שְׂדוֹתַי
			שְׂדוֹתֵיכֶם פְּנֵיכֶם

b. a]. But of נָכֶה and שָׂטֶה the plur. is נֵכִים Ps 35:15 and שֵׂטִים Hos 8:2.[548]

c. b]. On כִּדְנֵי Jb 6:7 see above § 47o.

d. *Rem.* 1. A variant of this formation is סְנֶה, on the analogy of שְׁכֶם besides שֶׁכֶם.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Rem. 2. The fem. of this formation is רָוָה or רְוָיָה Ps 23:5.

e. B.		Sing.		Pl.
(פְּעִי)	פְּרִי[a]	פֶּרְיְךָ	פִּרְיֵנוּ	גְּדָיִים[c]
	פְּרִי	פִּרְיוֹ	פֶּרְיְכֶם Ez 36:8[b]	גְּדָיֵי Gn 27:9
	פִּרְיִי	פִּרְיָהּ	פִּרְיָם (פֶּרְיָם)	גְּדֵיכֶם or גַּדְיֵכֶם

f. a]. In pause לֶחִי Ju 15:15, or חֲצִי 1K 16:21 and Ex 25:18.

g. b]. With suffixes הֶם and כֶם also פִּרְיהֶם and פִּרְיכֶם, etc.

h. c]. Also חֲלָאִים Cn 7:2, with א in place of ה, third radical; but צְבָאִים 1 Chr 12:8 and all cases of פְּתָאיִם occur with א of Prolongation and sounded Yod as third radical, while the Yod pluralis is missing. The plur. of כְּלִי is כֵּלִים;[549] cstr. כְּלֵי Jr 27:16; with suffixes כֵּלָיו Is 32:7, כְּלֵיהֶם. Similarly מִמְּעַי Jonah 2:2, מֵעֶיךָ Is 63:15 from מְעִי.

i. C. Other forms of the ל״ה stem are:

1. פָּעִי: עָנִי, נָקִי, etc.; cstr. נְקִי Ps 24:4; with suffixes עֲנִיו, עֲנִיֶּךָ Dt 15:11 (for עֲנִיֶּךָ) with Segol under the Yod on account of pause; plur. עֲנִיִּים, with Dagesh in the Yod, קְלִיּוֹת (Talmud, Pes. 29a). The form רָזִי־לִי Is 24:16 is of the same formation, with retraction of the tone on account of its proximity to a monosyllable.[550]

j. 2. פְּעוֹ: שְׁבוֹ Ex 28:19, תְּאוֹ Dt 14:5, דְּיוֹ Jr 36:18, and perhaps also בְּזֹה Is 49:7.[551] In the plur. and with suffixes the third radical may become א or Yod, thus שְׁבוֹאִים or שְׁבוֹיִים, דְּיוֹאֲךָ, etc.[552]

k. 3. פָּעוּ: אָחוּ Jb 8:11, שָׂחוּ Ez 47:5.[553]

l. 4. פְּעִי: קְשִׁי, צְרִי Ez 27:17. In the cstr. and non-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

pausal forms the Ḥolem usually changes to Ḥaṭef Ḳameṣ or Shewa, e. g. חֳרִי הָאַף Dt 29:23, חֳלִי ibid 28:61, וּצֳרִי Gn 37:25, קְשִׁי הָעָם Dt 9:27; also in pause עֳנִי La 3:1. This form is inflected with suffixes like פָּעְי (cf. above, e), with the Ḥolem changing to Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf, e. g. חָלְיוֹ 1K 17:17.

m. 5. פְּעִיע or פְּעוּע: הֲגִיגִי Ps 5:2, חֲזִיז Jb 28:26,[554] צְלִיל Ju 7:13, זְנוּנֵי Na 3:4.

n. f]. פְּעָה: בֻּכָה Ezr 10:1, הֶגֶה Jb 37:2, נֵדֶה Ez 16:33, כֶּסֶה Ps 81:4, and perhaps also קְצֵה Is 2:7[555] (which may, however, be from קֵץ with suffixed ה). In נְדָנַיִךְ Ez 16:33 the third radical changes to Nun.[556]

o. 6. פֵּעָה [=פֵּעַל]: גֵּאָה Is 2:12, רֵעָה 2S 15:37, אֵבֶה Jb 9:26; רֵעֶה הַמֶּלֶךְ 1K 4:5, with Segol in the second syllable in place of Ṣere; with suffixes the ה is rejected, e. g. רֵעוֹ, רֵעֲךָ, רֵעִים or רֵעֵיהֶם Jr 29:23 (with Ṣere unchanged to retain the sound of the ע), also without suff. רֵעַ Hos 3:1 גֵּא Is 16:6 and with prefixed מ, מֵרֵעִים Ju 14:11, מֵרֵעֵהוּ, ibid 20 or מְרֵעֵהוּ Pr 19:7 [in our text מֵרֵעֵהוּ].[557]

p. 7. פֹּעֶה: חֹזֶה Is 28:15 and 2K 17:12, רֹאֶה Is 28:7, יוֹרֶה Dt 11:14; plur. שׁוֹאִים, שֹׁאֵיהֶם Ps 35:17.

q. 8. פְּע: רִי Jb 37:11 (from רוה),[558] בְּנֵיהֶם Ez 27:32 (from ני),[559] צִי Is 33:21, עִי Jb 30:24, הִי Ez 2:10, אִי Is 23:2, כִּי ibid 3:24 (from כָּוָה according to some commentators);[560] also פִּי, although its absolute form is פֶּה, with suffixes פִּיו or פִּיהוּ, פִּי פִּיךָ (with middle radical Yod missing), פִּינוּ, פִּיהֶם; plur. עִיִּים, צִיִּים or צִים Nu 24:24, פִּים 1S 13:21 or פִּיוֹת Ju 3:16 or פִּיּוֹת Pr 5:4, and with the first radical doubled פִּיפִיּוֹת Ps 149:6; with suffixes פִּיוֹתָיו, פִּיוֹתֶיךָ, etc.[561] Of the same formation is שֶׂה, construct שֵׂה Dt 14:4, with suffixes שֵׂיוֹ ibid 22:1 or שֵׂיֵהוּ 1S 14:34.[562]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

r. 9. פַּע or פָּע: שַׁי Ps 76:12, גַּי Jos 8:11 (for גַּיְא Dt 3:29, but see above § 47e'), צוּ and קַו Is 28:10.13, הַשַּׁל 2S 6:7,[563] תָּו Ez 9:4, etc.; construct עַב Ex 19:9 (but also קָרתהוּ Is 34:11 [in our text קַו]), with suffixes יָדִי, יָדְךָ, etc., יֶדְכֶם Ex 32:29, also דִּמְכֶם Gn 9:5; plur. דָּמִים, cstr. דְּמֵי, and with suffixes דָּמַי, etc., דְּמֵיכֶם. The plur. of יָד is either יָדַיִם or יָדוֹת Ex 26:17. The form גֵּאָיוֹת Ez 7:16, is to be referred to גַּיְא Is 40:4 (see above § 65c). The Pathaḥ in וּמַנְךָ Ne 9:20 points to an inflection with the sharpening of the middle radical, although in this particular instance the Dagesh is omitted.[564]

s. *Rem.* Certain peculiarities are to be noted in the flexions of אָב and אָח; namely, the construct is אֲבִי (also אַב Gn 17:4) and אֲחִי, with suffixes: אָבִי and אָחִי etc., אָבִיהוּ and אָחִיהוּ, or אָבִיו and אָחִיו, etc., אֲבִיכֶם and אֲחִיכֶם, אֲבִיהֶם and אֲחִיהֶם;[565] plur. אָבוֹת and אַחִים with the initial vowel changing to Ḥaṭef Pathaḥ in the construct and when removed from the tone (exceptions: אֲחֵיכֶם Lv 25:46 and Nu 32:6); but when pretonic, the Pathaḥ of אַחִים is retained [the ח having Dagesh forte implication], or is changed to Segol before Ḳameṣ (cf. above § 9h).

	Sing.		*Plur.*	
t. D. (פַּע)	a]בֵּן		b]בָּנִים	
	בְּנִי	בְּנֵנוּ	בָּנַי	בָּנֵינוּ
	בִּנְךָ, בְּנֵךְ	בִּנְכֶם—ן	בָּנֶיךָ—יִךְ	בְּנֵיכֶם—ן
	בְּנוֹ, בְּנָהּ	בְּנָם—ן	בָּנָיו—יהָ	בְּנֵיהֶם—ן

u. a]. The Ṣere changes to Segol in the construct st., but is retained otherwise even when connected by Maḳḳef, e. g. בֶּן־שִׁשִּׁי Gn 30:19, בֶּן־קָטָן 2S 9:12, בֶּן־פָּרִיץ Ez 18:10. In שֵׁם, however, the Ṣere changes to Segol when connected by Maḳḳef to a tone-syllable.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

v. b]. The plur. of שֵׁם, however, is שֵׁמוֹת Gn 2:20, construct שְׁמוֹת Ex 1:1.

w. *Rem.* To the same category may be referred the nouns זֵר, עֵט, כֵּס, עֵץ, גֵּו Ex 25:11; although the Ṣere in these nouns is retained in the flexions of the sing., e. g. עֵצוֹ Hos 4:12 זֵרוֹ Ex 30:4; but it changes to Shewa in the construct plur., e. g., עֲצֵי Gn 22:3. The Ṣere in יֵשׁ changes to Ṣegol or Ḥireḳ with suffixes, e. g. יֶשְׁנוֹ Ex 3:8, הֲיִשְׁכֶם Dt 13:4.[a]

E. Nouns of the ל"ה Stem with Preformatives and Afformatives

x. 1. תָּפְעָה: תָּרְמָה Ju 9:31, תָּהֳלָה Jb 4:18 with Ḥaṭef Ḳameṣ (for Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf) shifted forward on account of the laryngeal,[567] תֹּאֲנָה Ju 14:4, with Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf changed to Ḥolem on account of the laryngeal, as in זֹעֲמָה Nu 23:7.[568]

y. 2. תִּפְעָה: תִּגְרַת Ps 39:11, תַּאֲלָתְךָ La 3:65, תַּאֲנָתָהּ Jr 2:24.

z. 3. תְּפָעָה: תְּעָלָה 1K 18:32, with first Ḳameṣ unchanged תְּעָלַת Is 7:3, תְּעָלוֹתֶיהָ Ez 31:4, so also תְּלָאָה.

a' 4. מַתְּפָעָה: מַתְּלָאָה 1 Mal 1:13 [see above § 63v and note 532]

b' 5. תַּפְעִית: תַּכְלִית, תַּעֲנִית; plur. תַּעֲנִיּוֹת.

c' 6. תַּפְעוּת: תַּרְבּוּת Nu 32:14, תַּחְנוֹתִי 2K6:8 (with Ḥolem instead of Shureḳ);[569] plur. תַּרְבּוּיוֹת or תַּרְבּוּתִים like תַּזְנוּתַיִךְ Ez 16:20.

d' 7. מַפְעִית: מַשְׂכִּית Lv 26:1, מַרְבִּית ibid 25:37; plur. מַשְׂכִּיּוֹתָם, מַרְבִּיּוֹת Nu 33:52.

a. It is also possible to say יֶשְׁוֹ and יֶשְׁכֶם [Gn 24:49] or יִשׁוֹ, יִשִׁי on the analogy of בְּנִי, בְּנוֹ.[566]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

e' 8. מַפְּעוּת: מַצְּתֶיךָ Is 41:12, from מַצּוּת (for מַנְצוּת), מַלְקוּת (Talmud).

f' 9. מַפְּעֶה or מִפְּעֶה: מַטֶּה, מַשְׁקֶה, מַרְאֶה, מַחְסֶה, מִקְנֶה (for מַנְטֶה), מַכֶּה (for מַנְכֶּה), etc.; constr. מַחֲנֵה Nu 2:3, מִרְעֵה Is 32:14; (but also מִקְוֵה 1K 10:28 and מִקְוֵא 2 Chr 1:16, with א for ה, in the absl.; and מִקְרָה Ec 9:2.3 in the cstr.); with suffixes מִקְרֵי, מִקְנְךָ Ex 34:19, מִקְנֵהוּ, מִקְרֶהָ Ru 2:3 and perhaps also מַרְאוֹ, מַרְאֵהּ, on the analogy of שָׂדֵהוּ 2K 8:2.5;[570] pl. מַעֲשִׂים, מַעֲשָׂיו, etc. The inflections of אַרְיֵה are based on אֲרִי (cf. above B.).

g' 10. הַפְּעֵה: הַרְבֵּה.

h' 11. מַפְּע: מַעַר 1K 7:36, מַעַל Lv 11:21, and with affixed ה: מִלְמַטָּה, מַטָּה, מִלְמַעְלָה, מַעְלָה. The tone remains, however, on the penultima, like in לַיְלָה; but, unlike לָמָּה, שָׁמָּה, יָמָּה, the Pathaḥ in מַטָּה (for מַנְטָה) is retained, except in pause. Of the same formation is perhaps מֶמֶר Pr 17:25, but see above § 64h [also note 540 ad loc.]

i' 12. מִפְּעָה: מִכְסָה Is 23:18, מִקְרָה Ec 10:18.

j' 13. מַפְּעָה or מִפְּעָה: מַרְאָה Nu 12:6, מִשְׂרָה Is 9:5.6, מֶחֱצָה Nu 31:36; inflected like פְּעָלָה (see above § 52a) but with initial syllable unchanged in the plur.: מִרְמוֹת, מַחְתּוֹת, מִצְוֹת, etc. Of the same formation are מַצָּה, מַכָּה, מַסָּה Jb 9:23.

k' 14. נִמְפְּעָה: נִמְבְזָה 1S 15:9.[571]

l' 15. אֶפְּעָה: אֶתְנָה Hos 2:14, אַחְוָתִי Jb 13:17.

m' 16. אֶפְּעָן: אֶתְנַן Ez 16:34, constr. אֶתְנַן Dt 23:19 (but also in the absl. אֶתְנַן Ez 16:34 and ibid v. 41); with suffixes אֶתְנַנֶּיהָ Mi 1:7.

n' 17. פְּעִיעוֹן: שְׁפִיפוֹן Gn 49:17, but see above § 56h.

o' 18. פָּעוֹן: חָרוֹן, יָגוֹן, etc., inflected like פָּעוֹל (cf.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

above § 49e). In הֵרוֹנֵךְ Gn 3:16 the Ṣere under the ה is either in place of Ḳameṣ, or of Ḥireḳ followed by Dagesh, and is unchangeable.

p' 19. פְּעוּת: כְּסוּת Jb 26:6, פְּדוּת Ex 8:19, etc.;[572] unchangeable in the flexions, e. g. שְׁבוּת עַמִּי Jr 30:3,[573] בִּשְׁחוּתוֹ Pr 28:10; and, with Ḥolem for Shureḳ חֲצוֹת לַיְלָה Ps 119:62, עֲנוֹת גְּבוּרָה Ex 32:18 and דְּוֹתָהּ Lv 12:2;[574] plur. like פְּעִית or פָּעוּת below.

q' 20. פְּעִית: בְּרִית, unchangeable throughout the flexions, e. g. בְּכִיתוֹ Gn 50:41; plur. בְּרִיתוֹת, וַחֲנִיתוֹתֵיהֶם Is 2:4, or חֲנִיתִים 2Chr 23:9, שְׁבִיתַיִךְ Ez 16:53.

r' 21. פָּעוּת: חָזוּת Is 21:2, חָסוּת ibid 30:3, also טָעוּת and חָנוּת in talmudic Hebrew; unchangeable in flexions, e. g. הָגוּת לִבִּי Ps 49:4, גָּלוּתִי Is 45:13 חָזוּתְכֶם ibid 28:18. The plur. is probably גָּלְיוֹת, with Ḳameṣ retained (on the change of ת to Yod see above § 55a).[575] The plur. form חֲנֻיוֹת Jr 37:16 may be traced back to a sing. חֲנוּת.[575a]

s' 22. פָּעוּת: עֵדוּת 2K 11:12, גֵּאוּת Ps 93:1; inflected like גָּלוּת (cf. above).

t' 23. פּוֹעָה: תּוֹעָה Is 32:6, שׁוֹאָה Jb 30:14; inflected regularly.

u' 24. פָּעָה or פֵּעָה: שָׁנָה, פֵּאָה, etc.;[576] constr. שְׁנַת, הָרַת Jr 20:17, מְאַת Ex 38:25.27, but also מְנָת Ps 63:11; with suffixes, שְׁנָתִי, שְׁנַתְכֶם, etc.; plur. שָׁנוֹת,[a] פֵּאוֹת, cstr.

a. The final ה is sometimes retained in the plural, or is changed to one of its cognate letters ו׳ית; e. g. אֲמָהוֹת Gn 31:33 [cf. above, note 474], שִׁפְחוֹתָיו Cn 5:13,[577] קְצוֹת Ps 65:9 and קְשׂוֹת Ex 37:16 (cstr. קְצוֹת Jb 26:14 and קְשׂוֹת Nu 4:7),[578] הָרִיוֹתָיו Hos 14:1. The forms אֲמָהוֹת and הָרִיוֹת may, however, be derived from the sings. אֲמָהָה and הָרִיָה, or הָרִית, of the formations פְּעָלָה and פְּעִית, respectively, on the analogy of עֲקֶרֶת and צָפִית Is 21:5, זָוִיָה or זָוִית (Talmud), pl. cstr. זָוִיּוֹת Zc 9:15.[579]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

and with suffixes שְׁנוֹת Ps 77:6 (but פַּאוֹת and מַאוֹת are unchangeable on account of the middle א [so Ibn Janaḥ, *Shor.* 393], שְׁנוֹתַי, גְּדוֹתָיו Jos 3:15, מְעוֹתָיו Is 48:19, קְנוֹתָם Ex 25:36 (for קְנוֹתֵיהֶם, see above § 45j); dual שְׂפָתַיִם, מָאתַיִם (for מְאָתַיִם, cf. above, note 200); cstr. שִׂפְתֵי, פַּאֲתֵי Nu 24:17. On the flexions of קֵבָה see above § 63p.[579a] The initial Ḳameṣ remains firm in both the sing. and the plur. of אָלָה and פָּרָה,[a] and in the plur. of מָנָה and הָרָה;[b] e. g. אָלֹתַי Ez 17:19 אָלוֹת הַבְּרִית Dt 29:20 פָּרָתוֹ Jb 21:10 פָּרוֹת הַבָּשָׁן Am 4:1, מָנוֹתֶיהָ Ez 2:9, הָרוֹת הַגִּלְעָד Am 1:13 הָרוֹתֵיהֶם 2K 8:12.[581] A secondary form of this formation is סְאָה, like שְׁכֶם alongside of שֶׁכֶם.

v' 25. פֶּעָה: פֶּחָה Ne 5:14 (with Segol in the initial syllable on account of the following ח with Ḳameṣ, cf. above § 9h); cstr. פַּחַת Ḥag 1:1 and Ezr 5:3, also פַּחַת (with the tone on the penultima) Ḥag 2:21; with suffixes פֶּחָתְךָ Mal 1:8; plur. פַּחוֹת Ez 23:6, פַּחוֹתֶיהָ Jr 51:28.57, also פַּחֲווֹת, of which the cstr. is פַּחֲווֹת Ne 2:7.[582]

w' 26. פֶּעֶת: שֶׁקֶת Gn 24:20; with suffixes קֳבָתָהּ Nu 25:8; plur. שְׁקָתוֹת[583] [שְׁקָתוֹת] and קְבָתוֹת; cstr. שִׁקְתוֹת, קִבְתוֹת, but בְּשִׁקֲתוֹת Gn 30:38 is from שֶׁקֶת, or from שָׁקָה on the analogy of שָׂפָה – שִׂפְתוֹת Ec 10:12.[583a]

x' 27. פֶּעֶת: צֶפֶת 2Chr 3:15, שְׁקָתוֹת Gn 30:38; it follows the analogy of פֶּעֶל in its inflections, but with ת Rafe (see, however, above as regards the form שִׁקֲתוֹת).

y' 28. פְּעוֹת: אָחוֹת and חָמוֹת, cstr. אֲחוֹת and חֲמוֹת; with suffixes אֲחֹתִי Gn 20:2, חֲמוֹתָהּ Ru 3:1, but וְלַאֲחוֹתוֹ

a. פָּרָה properly belongs to the Intensive formation קַטָּל (cf. above § 48c), hence it is unchangeable.[580]

b. הָרָה may also be construed in the sense of הַר, from the stem הרר, the first Ḳameṣ is thus compensatory and unchangeable.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Nu 6:7;[a] plur. אֲחָיוֹת and חֲמָיוֹת; constr. and with suffixes אַחְיוֹת, אַחְיוֹתַי Jos 2:13; also, with the masculine plur. characteristic only אֲחוֹתַךְ Ez 16:45–52 and וְלַאֲחוֹתֵיכֶם Hos 2:2 (cf. above § 66s).[584]

z' *Rem.* The Waw in this formation is probably in place of the radical ה, hence its change to Yod in the plural.

a'' 29. מִפְעַ: מְעִי Is 17:1.[585]

b'' 30. תּוֹעָה or תּוּעָה: תּוֹרָה, תּוֹדָה, תּוּגָה and, with the third radical distinct and sounded, תּוּשִׁיָּה Jb 5:12. The stems of these nouns are ירה, ידה, יגה and ישה respectively.[586]

c'' 3. תּוּעִין: תּוּפִין, plur. תּוּפִינִים, cstr. תֻּפִינֵי Lv 6:14.[587]

§ 67. Quadriliterals and Quinqueliterals

a. These nouns are not modelled after the פָּעַל stem, since no duplication of letters and no triliteral stem can be detected in them. We shall therefore list them without any classification with reference to the פעל stem:[588]

b. 1. פִּלְדָּשׁ Gn 22:21, שִׁנְעָר Ibid 14:1.9, סִרְפָּד Is 55:13, גִּזְבָּר Ezr 1:8, טִפְסָר Jr 51:27 (but וְטַפְסְרַיִךְ Na 3:17 is probably from טַפְסַר), פִּתְגָם המלך Es 1:20 (unchanged in the construct), פִּינְחָס (with quiescent Yod after the Ḥireḳ), כִּסְלֵו Ne 1:1 (with Ṣere in the second syllable).

c. 2. גַּנְזַךְ and שַׂרְעַף, of which the plur. is גַּנְזַכָּיו 1Chr 28:11 and שַׂרְעַפַּי Ps 94:19; כַּרְפַּס Es 1:6, אַרְגַּז 1S 6:8.11.15 (perhaps from רגז with prefixed א on the analogy of אַרְבַּע)

a. So also אַחֵיכֶם Lv 25:46 and Nu 32:6, which indicates an intensive formation with virtual doubling of the ח, as evidenced further by the plur. forms אַחִים, אַחֵי, and before ח with Ḳameṣ, אָחִיו, אָחִי.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

'so Ibn Janaḥ, *Shor*. 468; Barth § 151d; and Brock. *GvG*. I, 215], דַּרְדַּר Hos 10:8, חַשְׁמַל and חַשְׁמַלָּה Ez 8:2.

d. צָרְפַת Ob 1:20 and צָרְתָן 1K 7:46.

e. 4. דַּרְכְּמוֹנִים Ezr 2:69 plural of דַּרְכְּמוֹן from the stem דרכם [but see above § 60n and note 506a].

f. 5. בַּרְזֶל from which is the form בַּרְזִלַּי 2S 19:34.35, גַּרְזֶן Is 10:15 (with suffixes גַּרְזְנִי), [but see above § 56i], כַּרְמֶל of which we find כַּרְמִלּוֹ 2K 19:23 and הַכַּרְמֶלָה 1S 15:12.

g. 6. חֶרְמֵשׁ Dt 23:26, אַבְנֵט with suffixes אַבְנֵטְךָ Is 22:21 and אַבְנֵטִים Ex 28:40, יַרְדֵּן and פַּרְדֵּס.

h. 7. עֲזָאזֵל Lv 16:8.

i. 8. סְפָרַד Ob 20, סְמָדַר Cn 7:13, חֲנָמַל Ps 78:47. The Pathaḥ in these instances is retained even in pause. אֲרָרַט Jr 51:27 has Pathaḥ in the final syllable, but אֲרָרָט in all other instances [in pause].

j. 9. עֲמָלֵק, עֲרָפֶל (with sharpening of the ל under the effect of suffixes), בָּבֶל, אַמְרָפֶל.

k. 10. יִזְרְעֶאל Hos 1:4.

l. 11. שָׁרוּחֶן Jos 19:6.

m. 12. עֲטַלֵּף Dt 11:19, חֲבַצֶּלֶת Cn 2:1.

n. 13. שְׁקַעֲרוּר, fem. שְׁקַעֲרוּרָה, plur. שְׁקַעֲרוּרוֹת Lv 14:37.

o. 14. עַכָּבִישׁ Jb 8:14, חַלָּמִישׁ Ps 114:8.

p. 15. פְּתִיגִיל Is 3:24.

q. 16. כַּפְתּוֹר Ex 25:33 (plur. כַּפְתּוֹרִים), רַפְסוֹד (plur. רַפְסוֹדוֹת 2Chr 2:15), קַרְסֻלַּי 2S 22:37, and חַרְצֻבּוֹת Ps 73:4 (from קַרְסֹל and חַרְצֹב), חַרְגּוֹל, פַּרְעוֹשׁ, גִּבְעוֹל, גַּלְמוּד (with Shurek in place of Ḥolem).

r. 17. פִּילֶגֶשׁ Gn 36:12.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

s. 18. שׁוּתֶלַח Nu 26:36.

t. 19. בְּדֹלַח Gn 2:12 (on the analogy of רֹמַח of the פֹּעַל formation), with suffixes בְּדָלְחִי etc.

u. 20. The Quinqueliterals are: אַרְגְּוָן, אַרְגָּמָן (אַרְגְּוָנָא Dn 5:7.16), אֲגַרְטָל (אֲגַרְטְלֵי Ezr 1:9), אֲדַרְכּוֹן (אֲדַרְכֹּנִים 1Chr 29:7) [but see above § 60n], תַּחְפְּנֵס 1K 11:19.20 and תַּחְפַּנְחֵס Ez 30:18, צְפַרְדֵּעַ (with suffixes צְפַרְדְּעוֹ and plural צְפַרְדְּעִים), שַׁעַטְנֵז Lv 19:19 and רַעַמְסֵס.

§ 68. Peculiar Nouns

a. The following nouns are peculiar in formation and usage: מַיִם (for מַיְיִם, with suffixes מֵימַי, cstr. מֵימֵי or מֵי for מְיֵי), שָׁמַיִם (with Ḳameṣ changing to Shewa in the construct and with grave suffixes),[589] רֵחַיִם (with Ṣere probably firm on account of the ח).[590] These nouns are used in the collective sense and never occur in the singular.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOTES: CHAPTER FOUR, F

[507] In modern grammars the nouns of the weak verbs do not constitute a separate category, but are respectively reduced to the corresponding formations of the strong stems, allowing for the phonetic changes governing the weak stems; e. g. מַבָּט (from נבט), מוֹלָד (from ילד), מָקוֹם (from קום) מָסָךְ (from סכך), מַרְאֶה (from ראה) — all belong to the מַקְטָל formation. Similarly in the case of all nouns of the weak stems; cf. Ges.-K. § 85. Attempts at such a classification are already evident in the works of Ibn Janaḥ (cf. *Riḳ.*, chapter 11), and, occasionally, Ḳimḥi also recognizes this principle; cf. above §§ 56 l.m., 60s. t, etc.; also below § 64g–i, etc.

[508] Both מַבּוּל and מָשׁוֹר are referred by Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 235 ff. and *Shor.* 232) to the ע״ע stem, on the analogy of מָעֹז (from עזז). Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik.* 15 and 36f.) rejects Ibn Janaḥ's etymology and takes both as nouns of the פ״ן stem, the former in the sense of נִבְלֵי שָׁמַיִם Jb 38:37 and the latter in that of the mishnic נסרים (Sukk. 1,6). These etymologies are not, however, original with Joseph Ḳimḥi, since the derivation of מַבּוּל from נבל in the sense of נִבְלֵי שָׁמַיִם was already assumed by an earlier grammarian, quoted by Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 239); while the connection of מָשׁוֹר with the mishnic נסרים was also suggested by Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 534f.). The modern grammarians are likewise divided in their views with reference to מַבּוּל. Some derive it from יבל (Ges. s. v. and Stade § 275a), others take it in the sense of *destruction* from the stem נבל (cf. Koenig II, 153[1]). But מָשׁוֹר is generally referred to נשר=נסר. Cf. also above, note 189.

[509] The connection of שִׁין with הִשְׁין (from נשן) was already recognized by Menaḥem 170. But Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 509) refers it to the ע״י, in the sense of *entanglement* or *perturbation*, like תְּשַׂגְשֵׂגִי Is 17:11. Koenig II, 145 accepts Ḳimḥi's etymology of both שִׁין and שִׂיא. Cf. also Ges.-Buhl s. vv.

[509a] I was unable to locate the source quoted here by Ḳimḥi.

[510] Ḳimḥi has reference to its traditional pronunciation and usage in the Talmud, e. g. לֵידָתָן Shabb. II, 6; לֵידָתוֹ Yeb. XI, 2, etc. In all these instances an attempt at compensation for the missing first radical may be responsible for the retention of the Ṣere; cf. Brock. *Kurtzgef. vergl. Gramm.* § 11eδ.

Digitized by Google | Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[510a] In our text שְׁנַת, but see *Minḥath Shai* ad loc.

[511] The plural is built, according to Stade § 338 and Ges.-K. § 96 from the kindred עָר, which is still retained in proper nouns, while עֲיָרִים is regarded as erroneous, in imitation of the preceding עֲיָרִים (from עַיִר *ass* or *colt*) in the same verse. It is also possible to explain the Ḳameṣ as a contraction of the diphthong *ai* into *ā*, as in the case of בָּתִּים (cf. above, note 50; also below, note 514). See also Bauer-Leander § 78r

[512] So Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 361f.). Koenig II, 60 attributes it to the analogy of the ע"ע, or to the tendency of the sibilants to double themselves.

[513] Saadia already discusses the inflexions of nouns belonging to this category, and he apparently regards the Ḥireḳ in the second radical as the fundamental vowel, which changes in the construct state to Ṣere and is shifted backward under the first radical (cf. Dunash, *Tesh. ag. Saadia*, No. 107). Dunash, however, correctly recognizes the initial vowel as basic, the Ḳameṣ (as originally in pausal forms) changing to Ṣere (Ḳameṣ ḳaṭan) in the construct st. In proof of his contention he adduces the fact that the initial vowel takes the accent.

[514] On this peculiar form see above, note 50. Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 191) regards this form as well as רָאשִׁים, יָמִים (cf. below, note 520), זֵיתִים, etc. (perhaps also עָרִים by implication) as contractions of בָּיְתִים, רְאָשִׁים, יְוָמִים, זֵיְתִים, etc., in which the Yod or Waw quiesced and their vowels were thrown back under the preceding letters, with Ḳameṣ changing to Ṣere (Ḳameṣ ḳaṭan) in זֵיתִים. According to Ges.-Bergstrasser § 17i בָּתִּים evolved from the original **baiatim* (type **malakim*), the Waw and Yod having been regularly elided in Semitic languages between two short vowels; see Brock. *GvG.* I, 57 (cf. above, notes 241, 301a, and 305). The contraction of two short vowels consequently gave rise to the long *ā* in בָּתִּים; cf. below, note 578. According to Barth, *Orient. Studien* 790f. the plural יָמִים evolved under the analogical influence of שָׁנִים.

[515] That עָב may be derived from עוב (cf. יָעִיב La 2:1) is suggested by Ḥayyuj (N. 50). So also the modern grammarians. Ibn Janaḥ and Parḥon do not mention this stem.

[516] So Menaḥem 146, who connects it with פָּשׁוּ Ḥab 1:8, תִּפָּשׁוּ Jr 50:11, etc. So also Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 398); but Ibn Ezra suggests also the possibility of deriving it from נפש, in the sense of *rest*. The moderns generally refer it to the stem פשש — Arabic *fashishun, fasfash* (*foolishness*); cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v. and Koenig II, 81[1].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[517] But this form belongs to the ע״ע stem, to which it is referred by Ḥayyuj (N. 115) and the moderns.

[518] זָר is derived from the ע״ו also by Ḥayyuj (N. 46). So also the moderns (Ges.-Buhl s. v.). Neither Ibn Janaḥ, nor Parḥon mentions this noun.

[519] Ḥayyuj (N. 56) and Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 474) likewise refer this word to the ע״ו stem, but the modern grammarians derive it from the ע״ע.

[520] According to Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 191) these forms are in place of רְאָשִׁים and יְוָמִים, with the quiescing of the middle radical and the retraction of their vowels; cf. above, note 514. Similarly the modern grammarians regard רָאשִׁים as a contraction of רְאָשִׁים, the singular ראש being obscured from רַאשׁ>rā'sh (more original *ra'shu*); cf. Bauer-Leander § 78t. The form ראשיו occurs only once in Is 15:2 and probably evolved on the basis of ראש. But with regard to יָמִים opinions differ. Some of the moderns take it as indicative of a singular form יָם, of which יום is merely an incorrect obscuration or extension (Noeldeke, *Beitr.* 58). Others (Barth, *Orient. Studien* 791) construe יָמִים, יְמֵי, and יְמוֹת as new formations, having arisen under the influence of שָׁנִים, שְׁנֵי and שְׁנוֹת, to which they become assimilated in form because of their close relationship in meaning. More probably, however, this form is to be explained as a contraction of the original *yawamima*, the Wav having dropped out regularly between two short vowels, with the resultant lengthening of these vowels to *ā*, as in קָם<*ḳawama*, etc. (cf. above, notes 241, 305 and 514). This Waw is, however, retained in forms like שְׁוָרִים, שְׁוָקִים and דְּוָדִים.

[521] Ḳimḥi probably has reference here to Is 8:23, where in his comment. ad loc. he connects מוּעָף with עֵיפָתָה Jb 10:22 *darkness* and not, like Rashi and Targum, with עָיֵף in the meaning of *weariness*. This is after Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 360), who likewise refers both מוּעָף and מוּצָק to the ע״ו stem in the sense of *darkness* and *trouble*, respectively. So also most of the moderns (cf. Olsh. § 208; Koenig II, 95; also Ges.-Buhl s. vv.)

[522] According to Barth § 207a this is for תּוֹכוֹן (from תּוֹךְ), by dissimilation, like חִיצוֹן (from חוּץ) and רִאשׁוֹן (from ראש); cf. above, note 480.

[523] Menaḥem 48 and 49 likewise suggests that the Nun be taken as an afformative. So also Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 60) and Ibn Ezra (comment. ad loc.). The latter compares it to שִׁבְעָנָה Jb 42:13, the Nun being redundant, but this view was already previously advanced by Yefeth b. Ali (cf. Hirschfield in *History of Hebrew Grammarians and Lexi-*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

cographers, p. 33). Of the modern grammarians Ewald § 163 construes it as a feminine of בֹּשֶׁן (cf. צִפֹּרֶן). So also Koenig II, 185. Barth, however, considers the form as unique (§ 210c).

[524] This seems more plausible than the absolute שֵׂיב, assumed by the modern grammarians on the analogy of רֵיחַ and חֵיק; cf. Koenig II, 59 and Ges.-Buhl s. v. The latter forms are rather rare in the Bible and probably evolved from the inflected forms of the former.

[525] So Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 292 and 502) with regard to both נַחַת and שַׁחַת, also most of the modern grammarians (cf. Stade § 201d; Koenig II, 172f.; also Ges.-Buhl s. vv.). But זֶרֶת is referred by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 138) to the stem זרת, while the modern grammarians derive it from the stem זרה or זרר (cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v.). Some take it as a contraction of זְעֶרֶת (Aramaic זעיר *small*, cf. Ben Yehuda s. v.).

[526] The relationship between this form and עול *young* was already observed by Menaḥem 133. Ḥayyuj (N. 51), Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 359) and Parḥon 47d likewise connect it with עול; the latter interpreting it in the sense of *sucking* (cf. Arabic *ġawl*). So also the moderns (cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v.).

[527] Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 67f.) is uncertain whether this noun belongs to the ע״ו or to the ל״ה stem, on the analogy of מָנוֹתֶיהָ Es 2:9. Ḳimḥi's etymology is generally adopted by the modern grammarians; cf. Ges.-K. § 95 o. The form בָּמֳתֵי is derived by some of the moderns from a singular בָּמֶת, in which the feminine ending ת was erroneously taken as a third radical, as in דֶּלֶת–דְּלָתוֹת (cf. Bauer-Leander 597). בֹּמֶת may accordingly be taken as a secondary form of בָּמָה, on the analogy of בֹּשֶׁת (cf. בַּצֹּרֶת alongside of בַּצָּרָה, see above, note 469).

[528] Koenig II, 172 regards it either as a kindred or as a corruption of שׁוּרוֹתֶיהָ (cf. שׁוּרֹתָם Jb 24:17). So also Bauer-Leander 599 and Ges.-Buhl s. v.

[529] So Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 505f.), also Koenig (op. cit.). But some of the modern grammarians construe it as plural of שָׁת from שתה (cf. Stade § 184, Bauer-Leander 549 and Ges.-Buhl s. v.).

[530] But according to Ibn Ezra (commentary ad loc.) עֵדוֹתַי may be a forma mixta, having both the plural and singular characteristic endings, like מַכּוֹתְךָ Dt 28:59. Cf. above § 45j and notes 378 and 379, also Ges.-K. § 91n.

[531] This explanation of the plural עֵדוֹת is also offered by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 358). This is, however, an artificial and erroneous etymology. The plural form עֵדוֹת has its analogy in the Aramaic מַלְכְוָתָא Dn 9:29 and חֵיוָתָא Targum Yerushalmi ad Dt 34:12; the corresponding form

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

in Hebrew being מַלְכוֹת and חָווֹת (cf. above, note 368), or with Yod in place of Waw: מַלְכִיוֹת and עֲדִיוֹת. Under the influence of the subsequent Yod the further natural development of the latter forms would be מַלְכִיּוֹת and עֲדִיּוֹת, which is generally the traditional pronunciation of these forms alongside of the biblical forms מַלְכֻיוֹת Dn 8:22 and חֲנֻיוֹת (from חנות) Jr 37:16. Cf. Koenig II, 206; also above, note 471.

[532] The Dagesh in the second ם is due, according to Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 69) to false etymology, deriving the word from the stem מגר and regarding the first מ as a preposition, just as in the case of מַתְּלָאָה Mal 1:13, with Dagesh in the ת. To the same category may also belong מַסְּרוּרִים Jb 9:18 and מִצְּעִירָה Dn 8:9 (cf. above, note 491).

[533] In *Shor.* s. v. Ḳimḥi likewise reads מְצָדוֹת. So also Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 271). But our text has here מְצֹדוֹת. Ibn Janaḥ (ibid.) quite emphatically and elaborately contends that in both מְצוּדוֹת and מְצָדוֹת the Mem is a radical and the meaning is *elevation* or *height*, in proof of which he adduces the Arabic *maṣad*. Menaḥem 148, however, connects them in pursuance of his method, with צד, regarding the Mem as a preformative, for which etymology he is criticized by Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Galui* 143). The modern grammarians (Ew. § 160, Stade § 269e, etc.) generally refer them to the ע״ו stem and take the Ḳameṣ under the צ in מְצָד and מְצָדוֹת as representing the unobscured original Semitic *ā*, as in מְדָנִים (*Kethib*) Pr 6:14, etc. from מָדוֹן, over against the more common equivalents of the ע״ו: מָקוֹם, מָנוֹחַ, etc. (cf. Olsh. § 203b and Barth § 163c).

[534] קל is therefore taken in the sense of *lightness*. So also Targum, Rashi and Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 194), also some of the moderns (cf. Lagarde, *Ue.* 40; Koenig II, 44[3]; Perles *JQR.*, N. S., 1911, p. 130).

[535] This is not the case. Both formations belong to the *Ḳatl* type. Forms of the *Ḳatal* formation of the ע״ע are עָנָן, חָלָל, etc.

[536] But above § 63d Ḳimḥi refers this form to עַד (from the ע״ו). So also Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 355) and Ibn Ezra (comment. to Ex 15:18 and Ps 9:6). The latter explains it as an elliptical construction for וָעֶד עוֹלָם, in which the Pathaḥ changed to Segol on account of the pause and the Waw took Ḳameṣ, as in הוציא לֶחֶם וָיָיִן Gn 14:18. Here Ḳimḥi may have had in mind the following note from *Diḳduḳe* 64: כל קריה ועד עין פתח קטן בר מן חד קמץ קטן, ואנכי היודע ועד (ירמיה כ״ט, כ״ג) לפי שהוא מענין עד הגל הזה (בראשית ל״א, כ״ב). Modern grammarians refer this form to עֲד, of the ל״ה stem (cf. Barth, *Et.* 64; Koenig II, 264; Ges.-Buhl s. v.).

[537] These are in place of הַרָה* and סַלָּה*, by dissimilation; cf. above

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

§§ 9h and 27b[a]; also Koening II, 488 and 539. On the etymology of סֶלָה see also references in Ges.-Buhl s. v.

[538] The loss of the Ḳameṣ under the preformative Mem led also Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 190–191) to derive this noun from the ע"ו stem, which is the correct etymology (cf. Arabic *ḥāl*).

[539] Cf. above § 38a and note 270. The latter is the explanation offered by Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 362). So also the modern grammarians (Ew. § 65b and Koenig II, 473), but see Ges.-K. § 20 o.

[539a] These are rather to be referred to a ground-form מַקְטָל, with the phonetic variation due to the special character of the ע"ע verbs; see above, note 507. They are so regarded by the modern grammarians, see Barth § 162a.

[540] מֶמֶר and מֶכֶס would then be in place of מַמְרָר and מַכְסָס. So also Ḥayyuj (N. 111 and 112) and Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 225, *Opusc.* 202 and 220f.). Menaḥem s. v. likewise refers מכס to the stem כס. The possibility of the segolatization of these forms, *miḳṭal* or *maḳṭal*, is assumed also by the modern grammarians (**mamrar*>*mamar*>*mamr*>מֶמֶר). However, מכס is generally derived by the moderns from the stem מכס (Arabic *maks*), as is proved by the feminine form מִכְסָה (cf. Koenig II, 98 and 17[1]). Ḳimḥi was not unmindful of the difficulty that מִכְסָה presents and he takes it in place of מִכְסָה (see below, *1*). In the etymology of מֶשֶׁק Ḳimḥi follows Ibn Ezra ad loc., but Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 277) assumes a stem משק. So, after Ibn Janaḥ, Ges. s. v. and most of the modern grammarians (cf. Koenig II, 2 and Ges.-Buhl s. v.). With regard to מֶמֶר see also below § 66h'.

[541] So Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 39, *Opusc.* 220f. and *Shor.* 367), Ibn Ezra (comment. ad loc.) and Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Galui* 150). So also Koenig II, 98 with regard to מֹרֶךְ; but מֹעַל is derived, in his opinion (ibid. 116), from עלה, the form being in place of מָעֳלָה (of the Hof'al type), with the obscuring of the Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf in Ḥolem (cf. תֹּאַר–תָּאֳרוֹ). The segolatization of מֹרֶךְ is, however, more plausibly explained as having evolved in the same manner as מֶמֶר (see above), thus **murruk*>*muruk* >*murk*>מֹרֶךְ (cf. Brock., *GvG.* I, 381). Ḥayyuj (N. 117) considers the מ in מֹרֶךְ as a radical, and he is criticized on that account by Ibn Chiquitilla (ibid.), who accepts Ibn Janaḥ's etymology.

[542] Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik.* 26), likewise, takes the ת of תְּפִלָּה as a preformative. But Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 547) and Ibn Ezra (commentary ad loc.) connect it with תָּפֵל, regarding the ת as the first radical. So also the moderns; cf. Barth § 21c and Koenig II, 157.

[543] Moses Ibn Chiquitilla (commentary ad loc., published in Har-

Digitized by Google — Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

kavy's *Festschrift* 332) and Ibn Ezra (comment. ad loc.) construe it in the sense of הוֹלֵלוֹת, while Saadia (comment. ad loc.) connects it with יָהֵלּוּ. Both interpretations, however, postulate a ע״ע stem. Ibn Janaḥ, on the other hand, prefers to assume a stem of the strong verbs (תהל, *Shor.* 541). The modern grammarians are at variance in their opinions on the etymology of this noun. Dillmann s. v. refers it to the stem תהל, Eth. *taḥala* (*to stray*). Barth § 179, Rem. 3, adduces the analogy in the nouns primae radicalis Waw in Arabic and derives it from the stem יהל (Arabic *wahila* "to err"). Koenig II, 148f. compares the masc. form תֹּהֶל (from הלל) to תֹּרֶן (from רנן), for *tuhlal* and *turnan* (cf. סֹרֶךְ above, note 541).

[544] So Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 69 and *Shor.* 64), who criticized Menaḥem and Ḥayyuj for regarding the ת as a radical. So also the moderns (Koenig II, 298 and Bauer-Leander 497). The segolatization in these instances (from *tablal* and *tamsas*) is of the same type, then, as סֶמֶר and סֶעֶל (see above, notes 540 and 541).

[545] Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 121) refers it to the stem הםס (cf. Arabic *hamasa*). So also most of the moderns; cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v. and Koenig II, 71.

[546] The permanence of this Ḳameṣ probably points to the influence of Ara maic, cf. Bauer-Leander 580.

[547] So Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 91). Baer reads here נאות, probably נְאוֹת = נִיאוֹת (cf. לֵילוֹת and נִיאוֹתֶיךָ Ez 35: 8). Ginsburg and others read ניאות, probably נְיָאוֹת. The Ḳere in this instance and in all other passages, נֶאֱיוֹת, is perhaps a combination of the two possible readings; cf. Ges.-K. § 93v; Koenig II, 58; and Bauer-Leander 582.

[548] These forms are to be referred, according to Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 304), either to the ל״ה, on the analogy of נְאִים, the singular being נָכָה and שָׂטָה; or to the ע״ו, on the analogy of מֵתִים, with the third radical Hē transposed and changed to middle radical Waw. Modern grammarians generally accept the former opinion (cf. Koenig II, 78f. and Ges.-Buhl s. נכה; but שָׂטִים is derived by the latter from ע״ו). These forms may also be taken as analogous to כֵּלִים, the singular being נְכָה and שֵׂטָה, or נֵךְ and שֵׂט; see below.

[549] According to Olsh. §§ 145 and 153 and Stade § 338 this points to a sing. כֵּל and כֵּלָה, the plural כֵּלִים being analogous to שֵׁמוֹת. But Koenig II, 63 regards it as a shortened form from כְּלָיִים (cf. שָׁנִי from שָׁנַיִ and לֵוִי from לְוַיִ; see above, note 447; also Albright, *Archeology And The Religion of Israel*, chapter IV, note 42).

[550] Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 475f.) regards the Yod as extraneous and

Digitized by Google　　Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

takes it in the sense of רָז *secret*. But he also cites the opinion of some-one who refers it to the ל״ה stem. The latter is the etymology given by some of the modern grammarians (cf. Barth § 54f. and Koenig II, 134).

551 Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 188) construes it as an Infinitive in the adjectival sense, while Ibn Ezra (ibid., Kirchheim's note) regards it as an adjec-tive. Ibn Janaḥ's etymology, construing the word as an Infinitive in the sense of a *passive* adjective (for בְּזוּי נפש) has its analogies in Arabic (cf. Barth § 110).

552 Cf. Midrash Samuel XXVII, 9: כמה דיואות משתפכות; but also דְּיוֹת Gn Rabba XLVIII, 12. The change of yod to א is due to dissimi-lation, in order to prevent the concurrence of two identical letters.

553 These forms are to be construed, according to Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 64) either as פָּעוּל, or as פָּעֻל, like אֲרֹךְ Nu 26:40 (cf. נִישְׁתַּחֲוָ<וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ). The latter is the view held by the moderns (Olsh. § 76b; Koenig II, 60f.; etc.).

554 Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor*. 148) derives חָזִיז from ע״ע (חזז). The modern grammarians refer also הָגִיג to a ע״ע stem (cf. Barth § 85b; Koenig II, 132; Ges.-Buhl s. vv.).

555 So Baer and Ginsburg. In our text both נדה and קצה have Ṣere in the initial syllable.

556 So Ḥayyuj (*Noviye Materiali*, ed. Kokowzoff, Arabic text, p. 54). Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 288), on the other hand, regards the ה in נֵדָה as replacing the Nun, the stem being נדן. The modern grammarians assume the stem נדן (Assyrian *nadānu* = נתן) for נְדָנַיִךְ (cf. talmudic נדוניא) and the stem נדה (Arabic *nada* "gift") for נֵדָה; cf. Koenig II, 73; Ges.-Buhl s. vv.; Ben Yehuda s. vv.

557 Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 475) likewise reads Shewa under the מ and takes it as plural of מְרֵעַ. The sing. absolute מֵרֵעַ is assumed also by most of the modern grammarians, over against some who regard the מ as a preposition in the partitive sense; cf. Koenig II, 116f. and Bauer-Leander 534.

558 That בְּרִי is to be referred to the stem רוה, the ב being a preposi-tion, is suggested by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 472). The same opinion is held by Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Galui* 150), who includes in the same category, after Ḥayyuj (N. 86), the form בְּנֵיהֶם. Ibn Ezra (comment. ad loc.) rejects this etymology and prefers to derive בְּרִי, after the Targum and Saadia ad loc., from the stem ברה. Most of the modern gram-marians adopt Ḳimḥi's etymology (cf. Stade § 118c; Koenig II, 64; Ges.-K. § 24b).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[559] So some of the modern grammarians, while others regard it as apheretic for נְהִי (cf. Koenig II, 63 f. and Ges.-Buhl s. v.).

[560] So Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik.* 13) and previously Ḥayyuj (*Noviye Mater.*, Arabic text, p. 14). This is based on the talmudic interpretation (Shab. 62b) and is generally accepted by the moderns; cf. Stade, Koenig, and Ges.-K., loc. cit.

[561] The origin and the development of this form is still a subject of controversy among the grammarians. According to Olsh. 314 and Stade §183 פֶּה stands for פִּי (from the stem פיה or פוה), with the construct פִּי for פֵּי or פֶּה (cf. שֶׂה). The absolute פֶּה for פֵּי has its analogy in שָׂדֶה (=שָׂדַי) and יִגְלֶה (=יִגְלַי); cf. above, notes 306b, 373 and 375. Koenig II, 103 refers it to the stem פאה *to breathe*, or *to blow*, and takes it as a syncope for פְּאֶה (ground-form *pi'ay*). In view, however, of the parallel forms in Assyrian (*pū*), Arabic (*fūh*, *fam*, *famm*, *fumm*), Biblical Aramaic (פֻּם, פֻּמָּא), and Syriac (*pūm*, *pūma*), Barth (*ZDMG.*, XLI, 634) assumes a twofold development (פם and פו) from the same stem (פמו). Others see in this form traces of the early case-endings (cf. Bauer-Leander 620). Thus פֶּה is in place of פִּי (cf. Arabic *thamāni* — Hebrew שְׁמוֹנֶה, Arabic *bāni* — Hebrew בּוֹנֶה, etc.). The latter is either the original form terminating in a long vowel (ī-genitive ending), or has arisen from the construct in consequence of assimilation to the genitive ending of the following noun (cf. the reduplicated plural פִּיפִיּוֹת, in which the regular plural ending וֹת– was added to the reduplicated plural form because of misunderstanding or analogical influence); cf. Bauer-Leander ibid. and 524.

[562] Cf. Stade § 183: שֶׂה is for שַׂי [cf. פֶּה for פַּי, preceding note]. Lagarde (*Ue* 81f.) derives it from the stem ישי, שֶׂה being for שַׂי = *wishay*; but according to Koenig II, 104, it is from a ground-form *si'ay*. Cf. also Barth § 2b, Brock. *GvG.* I § 75b.y and Ges.-Buhl s. v.

[563] So Menaḥem 174 and Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 515: על השגגה והטעות והוא שם חסר כמו צו לצו קו לקו); also some of the modern grammarians (cf. Koenig II, 85 and Ges.-B. s. v.).

[564] Some of the codd. have מֶנֶךָּ. Ḳimḥi is, however, right in assuming the sharpening of the Nun in the inflection, cf. the Arabic *mannu*. The loss of the Dagesh in the Nun may be due to its being vowel-less (Koenig II, 40; see also Ges.-Buhl s. v.).

[565] Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 9) likewise derives these nouns from the ל״ה stem. The origin of these forms, including also חם, is variously explained by the modern grammarians. Koenig II, 86, maintains that because of the frequent use of these nouns ever since the early stages

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

of the language, their original tri-consonantal form is retained in the construct and before the singular suffixes; while others regard the Ḥireḳ in these inflected instances as Ḥireḳ campaginis — the remains of the obsolete genitive endings; cf. Ges.-K. §§ 90k and 96.

566 According to Stade § 370b the reading intended by the consonantal text is יֶשְׁנוֹ, cf. קִבְּנוֹ for קָבְנוֹ (see § 32d and note 181). So also Ges.-K. § 100. Koenig II, 102 and 444, regards it as a secondary form of an earlier and more original יֶשְׁנוּ or יֶשְׁוֹ. As to the medieval grammarians, Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ*. 36 f.) and Ibn Bal'am (*Noviye Materiali*, ed. Kokowzoff [text] 120) explain this form as euphoneous for יֶשְׁוֹ or יֶשׁוֹ. See also below, note 606.

567 Cf. above § 64m, where Ḳimḥi derives it from הלל. See also note 543 ad loc.

568 So Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 326). Koenig II, 192, likewise includes it in this category. But Barth § 187, Rem. 1, questions the possibility of such a formation (תַּקְטְלָה); and he connects תַּאֲנָה with תְּנוּאוֹת Jb 33:10, while תַּרְמָה is regarded by him as doubtful both in formation and meaning.

569 It is, accordingly, not necessary to assume with some of the modern grammarians (cf. Bauer-Leander 591) that the singular suffix is attached in this instance to the plural ending as in מַכּוֹתֶךָ Dt 28:59, etc., see above § 45j.

570 But singular forms with apparently plural suffixes also occur in nouns of this type because of their original *ăy* termination in the sing., with *ăy* contracted to ē, e. g. מַחֲנֶיךָ Dt 23:15; מִשְׁתֵּיהֶם Is 5:12, Dn 1:10.16; מַרְאֶיךָ Cn 2:14, etc.; cf. Ges.-K. § 93ss.

571 The מ is generally regarded as extraneous by the earlier grammarians, the intended form being the Nif'al נִבְזָה (cf. Ibn Janaḥ, *Riḳ*. 25 and Rashi ad loc.). Ibn Janaḥ (ibid.), however, advances another explanation; namely, that the form originally intended was an adjective מְבֻזָּה, on the analogy of מַרְבָּה Ez 23:32; but that a Nun was prefixed to give this adjective a quasi-Nif'al meaning, as in the case of נְסִבָּה 2Chr 10:15, where the Nun was similarly prefixed to the noun סִבָּה. This is an ingenious explanation, except for the fact that the examples adduced are themselves unique and of disputed formations. Modern grammarians also grapple with this difficult form. Ewald § 126b, note 2, considers the possibility of construing it as Nif'al of a quadriliteral מבזה, but prefers to read here נְמָזָה *starved* (cf. Dt 32:24 מְזֵי רָעָב). The latter etymology is accepted in part also by Boettcher II, 406 ("composed of נְמָזָה and נִבְזָה") and is regarded as plausible by Koenig

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

I, 538. The latter, however, suggests also that it be construed as a forma mixta, composed of the Nif'al and the Hof'al (נִבְזֶה and מֻבְזֶה). Others regard them as scribal errors caused by the confusion with נמס and is to be read נִבְזֶה וְנִמְאָסֶת; cf. Ges.-K. § 75y.

572 Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 65) regards the ת as in place of the third radical ה. Modern grammarians, however, consider the ת as the regular feminine ending and the Waw as the radical and as an organic part of the formation. As to the particular form of the nouns of this category, the modern grammarians are at vairance in their explanations. Lagarde *Ue.* 147 ff. regards such forms as דְּמוּת etc. as misreadings by the punctuators, arising under the influence of the regular Hebrew form דְּמֻנָה (דְּמֻנְתִי > דְּמוּתִי), etc. But this view is held untenable by most of the other grammarians, who explain them as segolatized forms with the ending ת, in which the initial vowel of the *Ḳill* and *Ḳutl* formations becomes Shewa (cf. Barth § 260c; Koenig II, 165 and 166; Margolis, *The Feminine Ending "T" In Hebrew* 32 ff.).

573 Ḥayyuj connects this word both with the ע"ו (N. 57) and with the ל"ה (N. 96) stems. Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 500) apparently prefers to derive it from the ע"ו. The origin of this form is disputed also by the modern grammarians. Some derive it from the ע"ו on the analogy of לָזוּת (from לוז) Pr 4:24, in both of which the long *ū* may have disappeared, probably under the analogical influence of the ל"י nouns of this formation; cf. Lambert 55[3]. Others refer it to the ל"ה (cf. Koenig II, 167 and Ges.-Buhl s. v.).

574 The last two examples are, however, distinctly Infinitives of the ל"ה stem; cf. Ḥayyuj (N. 12 and 89).

575 On the plural formation of these nouns see Margolis, op. cit. 33; also above, note 471. The preservation of the Ḳameṣ in the inflections is due to the Aramaic influence; cf. Koenig II, 165.

575a A singular חָנוּת is assumed also by Margolis, loc cit.

576 Saadia already recognized the final ה in these instances as a radical, which changes to ת in the flexions; witness the criticism of *Rav Mevasser* (Harkavy's ed. of Saadia's *'Agron* 72). Menaḥem, according to his method, still regards this ה as a servile letter. Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 252) regards the ה in forms like מֵאָה as the feminine afformative, the ה radicalis having dropped out. According to Barth § 2b the original third radical in such cases was mistaken early in the Semitic languages for the feminine ending and was treated as such in the flexions.

577 In שְׁפָחוֹת the feminine ending was erroneously taken for the third

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

radical, on the analogy of דֶּלֶת-דְּלָתוֹת (cf. Noeldeke, *Beitr.* 58; also Bauer-Leander 600).

578 Of the last two examples, קְצוֹת is regarded by Lagarde *Ue.* 10.150 and Barth § 61c as regular plural of קְצָת (contraction of קְצָוָה), just as מְנָיוֹת is the plur. of מְנָת (contraction of מְנָיָה; cf. above, note 514); while the singular of קְשׂוֹת is according to Koenig II, 165, קְשָׂוָה (Arabic *ḳashwah*; cf. Frankel, *Aram. Fremdw.* 64). The kinship of the latter with its Arabic equivalent was already observed by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 459), who refers also קֶסֶת to the same origin; cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v. קסת.

579 So Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Saadia* 7), Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 124) and the moderns (Ewald § 189e; Koenig II, 175; Ges.-K. § 84g) with regard to הָרִיּוֹת.

579a Both in *Mikhlol* (ed. Lyck 176b) and in *Shor.* s. v. קבב, Ḳimḥi seems uncertain as to the origin of this noun, although he is inclined to derive it from the ע״ו stem. In corroboration of this etymology he quotes the mishnic forms קֵבָת and קֵבָתָהּ Ḥullin 8, 5, in which the Ṣere is unchangeable. The moderns likewise regard it as of doubtful derivation; see Koenig II, 185 and Ges.-Buhl s. v. קבב.

580 Modern grammarians refer it to the ע״ע stem, the form being analogous to צָרָה, חֻפָּה, etc., which are unchangeable formations; cf. Koenig II, 175 and Ges.-Buhl s. v.

581 The medieval grammarians vary in their interpretation of the plural of this form. Menaḥem apparently construes it in the sense of *mountains*, probably after Saadia (cf. *Tesh. ag. Saadia* by Dunash, p. 6). This interpretation is not found in our text of Menaḥem's *Maḥbereth*, but it is quoted in his name by Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Menaḥem* 33). The latter takes it in the meaning of *pregnant*. So also Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 123f.) and Ḳimḥi (comment. to 2K 8:12); while Ibn Ezra (comment. to Amos 1:13) accepts Menaḥem's view. Modern grammarians generally interpret it in the sense taken by Dunash; cf. Koenig II, 177 and Ges.-Buhl s. v.

582 The plural points, according to Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 400), to a singular פַּחֲוָה, on the analogy of שַׁלְוָה, of which פֶּחָה is a syncope.

583 Ḳimḥi hereby adheres to his principle that the Ḥolem in these formations does not change to Shewa; see above § 47a', but also note 413 ad loc. Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 531) regards שֶׁקֶת as a secondary formation of שׁוֹקָה (cf. above, note 469), on the analogy of עֲטֶרֶת and עֲטָרָה; but this would make the plural form שְׁקָתוֹת even more difficult, for the plural would then have to be שׁוֹקוֹת, like חִדּוֹת. Barth § 79g assumes a singular שֶׁקֶת for this plural, but others regard it as a case of dissimilation for שְׁקָתוֹת(?), like חִיצוֹן for חוּצוֹן (cf. above, note 522), with the fem. termination ת erroneously taken as a radical; cf. Bauer-Leander 615.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[583a] Cf., however, above § 3f (*Mikh.* 130a), where Ḳimḥi reads this form with simple Shewa under the ק (בְּשִׁקְתוֹת). Ḳimḥi seems to quote biblical passages largely from memory, and such slight errors and inconsistencies in his quotations are not unusual. Cf. above, note 450a.

[584] Ḥayyuj apparently assumes two possible singular forms beside the ordinary אָחוֹת; namely, אָחָה of which the plural is אָחוֹת, אָחוֹתַךְ Ez 16:45ff., etc. with only one plur. characteristic (cf. מַכּוֹתְךָ Dt 28:59), and אָחְיָה, plural אֲחָיוֹת, אַחְיוֹתַךְ ibid 16:52. The Waw in the sing. אָחוֹת is regarded by him as the third radical, with the plural אֲחָיוֹת for אֲחָווֹת (cf. *Noviye Materiali*, ed. Kokowzoff, Russian text, 54f.). A singular אָחָה, feminine of אָח, which changed to אָחוֹת is assumed also by Ibn Ezra (Ṣ. 65bf.). But according to Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 21 and 159) the forms אָחוֹת and חָמוֹת are evolved from the singular אָחְיָה and חָמְיָה, formations like רְוָיָה Ps 23:5 and חָכְמָה, in which the Waw (the cognate of the Yod) quiesced in Ḥolem and thereby caused the change of the following ה to ת; cf. רְעוּתָהּ Is 34:16 from רְעָיָה (רַעְיָתִי Cn 2:2), in order to avoid concurrence of two quiescent letters. A similar explanation, but in modern phraselogy, is that of Ges.-K. § 96; namely, that the basic form is *'ăḥăwăt* or *'ăḥăyăt*, in which the Waw or Yod was elided, and the resulting combination *ăă* gave rise to *ā*, the latter obscruring in *ō*. According to others אָחוֹת and חָמוֹת arose from *'aḥā* and *ḥamā* with the feminine ending ת, the *ā* being either the old Semitic construct st. of the accusative (Barth *ZDMG.*, 1899, p. 598), or the vocative particle (Bauer *ZDMG.*, 1915, p. 561). See also Speiser, *AJOS*, LVI, 1, 40. The plural אֲחָיוֹת is generally assumed by the ancient and the modern grammarians, but the traditional reading of this form in the Talmud (Yeb. III, 1, etc.) is אַחְיוֹת or אֲחָיוֹת. This reading is given also by De Balmes (*Mikne Abraham*). Both plur. forms, אֲחָיוֹת and אַחְיוֹת are employed by the Paytanim and by later Hebrew writers (cf. quotations in Ben Yehuda s. v.).

[585] So Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Saadia* 8) and Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 565). But they merely construe the Mem as a preformative without referring to the stem. The Arabic equivalent is מִעָי, which may have become מְעִי under the influence of the analogous עִי (cf. Koenig II, 117). On the relationship between these two formations see above, note 404. Some lexicographers derive it from a singular absolute מֵעַ or מֵעָה (Buxtorf and Gesenius), but most of the moderns read also the absolute form מְעִי, connecting it with עִי (cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v.)

[586] Ḳimḥi follows apparently Ibn Chiquitilla's etymology, who derives תּוּשִׁיָּה from יֵשׁ (cf. Harkavy's *Festschrift* 233, also Kokowzoff's *Noviye Materiali* [text] 66), over against Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 549 and

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Riķ. 63), who refers it to חשה and regards it as a פוּעִיל formation. The moderns likewise derive it from ישה in the sense of יֵשׁ (cf. Stade § 262; Barth § 189e; Koenig II, 193). That this word may be traced to the stem ישע, the ע having elided as in רוּת (for רְעוּת), is suggested by Bauer-Leander 196.[1] Cf. also Ges.-Buhl s. v.

[587] The stem is therefore, according to Ķimḥi, אפה. But Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 547) refers also this noun to the stem חפן (cf. תֻחְשִׁיָּה in the preceding note). The difficulty of this noun was already observed by the talmudists (Men. 50b), who attempt to explain it either as a combination of תאפֶינָּה and נא "you shall bake it partly raw", or of תאפֶינָּה and נָאָה "you should bake it well." Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit.) considers the talmudic etymology, interpreting it as a combination of תאפֶינָּה and נָא, as quite plausible, and he adduces an analogy from Persian. Modern grammarians are also puzzled by this form and are uncertain as to its meaning (cf. Koenig II, 155 and Ges.-Buhl s. v.).

[588] But Ibn Janaḥ (*Riķ.* 53ff. and 74ff.) does attempt to classify these nouns on the basis of a פעל ground-form, and he is consequently forced very often to resort to artificial etymologies. Most of these nouns are, however, of foreign origin and are not therefore governed by the principles of Hebrew morphology. Cf. also above, note 346.

[589] Cf. above § 45 and note 381. The origin of this word was also disputed by Menaḥem and Dunash. The latter criticizes the author of *Maḥbereth* for regarding the Yod in מֵי הַיָּם Ex 15:19 as a servile letter (cf. *Tesh. ag. Menaḥem* 26). Saadia makes a distinction between מֵימֵי and מֵי, the former referring to drinkable, the latter to non-drinkable water (quoted by Baḥya on Ex 7:19). According to some of the modern grammarians, the construct מֵימֵי points to an old Semitic plural form by reduplication, traces of which are left in all Semitic and Indo-European languages (cf. the construction יום יום, איש איש, etc., and the plural form פִּיפִיּוֹת; see above, note 561), the singular form being *māiu* or *māu*. On such plural formations in other languages see Sapir, Edward, *Language* 79f.; also Jespersen, *Mankind* 217f. The form מַיִם <*maimu* evolved, accordingly, early in the history of the language as a back formation from this reduplicated plural, and it gave rise, on account of its dual form, to a new construct מֵי (cf. Bauer-Leander 619f.). שָׁמַיִם may have developed in the same manner (ibid. 621).

[590] But רֵחַיִם is a regular dual; the singular being רֵחָה, from the ל״ה stem רחה; Arabic *raḥā* (cf. Lagarde *Ue.* 157; Koenig II, 78; Ges.-Buhl s. v.).

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

G. NUMERALS

	With the Masculine		With the Feminine	
	Absol.	Constr.	Absol.	Constr.
1	אֶחָד	[a] אַחַד	[b] אַחַת	אַחַת
2	[c] שְׁנַיִם	שְׁנֵי	[c] שְׁתַּיִם	שְׁתֵּי
3	[d] שְׁלֹשָׁה	שְׁלֹשֶׁת	שָׁלֹשׁ	[d] שְׁלֹשׁ
4	[e] אַרְבָּעָה	אַרְבַּעַת	אַרְבַּע	אַרְבַּע
5	חֲמִשָּׁה	חֲמֵשֶׁת	חָמֵשׁ	חֲמֵשׁ
6	שִׁשָּׁה	שֵׁשֶׁת	[f] שֵׁשׁ	שֵׁשׁ
7	[g] שִׁבְעָה	שִׁבְעַת	שֶׁבַע	שְׁבַע
8	שְׁמֹנָה	שְׁמֹנַת	שְׁמֹנֶה	שְׁמֹנֶה
9	תִּשְׁעָה	תִּשְׁעַת	תֵּשַׁע	תְּשַׁע
10	עֲשָׂרָה	עֲשֶׂרֶת	עֶשֶׂר	עֶשֶׂר

	With the Masculine	With the Feminine
11	אַחַד עָשָׂר [h] עַשְׁתֵּי עָשָׂר	אַחַת עֶשְׂרֵה עַשְׁתֵּי עֶשְׂרֵה
12	[600] שְׁנֵים עָשָׂר שְׁנֵי עָשָׂר Ez. 32:1	[600] שְׁתֵּים עֶשְׂרֵה שְׁתֵּי עֶשְׂרֵה Ez. 32:1
13	[i] שְׁלֹשָׁה עָשָׂר	[i] שְׁלֹשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה שְׁלָשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה

§ 69. Cardinal Numbers

a. a]. This form occurs also in the absolute state, e. g. Gn 48:22, 2S 17:22, Dt 28:55, Zc 11:7 (although the genitive הַמַּקְלוֹת may there be implied),[591] and, with א omitted, חַד Ez 33:30. The plural is אֲחָדִים Gn 29:20.

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

b. b]. In pause אָחָת Ex 36:10.12.[592] This form is either fem. of אחד (for אחדת), or, in my opinion, is to be traced back to a masculine אַח (cf. also אָח Ez 18:10, with final ת or ד omitted).[593]

c. c]. With suffixes שְׁנֵינוּ, שְׁנֵיכֶם, etc. The form שְׁתַּיִם is in place of שְׁנְתַּיִם, with Dagesh lene retained after the Yod with Shewa is rejected, and it is vocalized on the analogy of שְׁנַיִם.[594]

d. d]. The Ḥolem in שְׁלֹשָׁה and שָׁלֹשׁ changes to Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf in the construct state of the latter and with suffixes in the former, e. g. שְׁלָשׁ־עֶשְׂרֵה Gn 14:4,[595] שְׁלָשְׁתְּכֶם and שְׁלָשְׁתָּם Nu 12:4. The form מְשֻׁלֹּשׁ Gn 38:24 is of a different formation in the same meaning.[596]

e. e]. The dual is אַרְבַּעְתַּיִם 2S 12:6, with suffixes אַרְבַּעְתָּם Dn 1:17.

f. f]. The Ṣere changes to Segol in שֵׁשׁ, when connected by Maḳḳef to a tone-syllable, e. g. שֶׁשׁ־הֵנָּה Pr 6:16.

g. g]. The form שִׁבְעָתָם 2S 21:9 cannot be referred to שִׁבְעָה, but to שִׁבְעַת.[597] The dual is שִׁבְעָתַיִם. The Nun in שִׁבְעָנָה Jb 42:13 is pleonastic on the analogy of בָּשְׁנָה Hos 10:6 (for בּוֹשָׁה).[598]

h. h]. The word עַשְׁתֵּי is difficult. Ibn Janaḥ [*Riḳ* 238] construes it as being in place of עַל שְׁתֵּי, but its use in the masculine militates against this etymology. Ibn Ezra [*Yesod Mispar*, ed. Pinsker, p. 167 f.] refers it to עֶשְׁתֹּנוֹתָיו Ps 146:4, taking it in the meaning of "the thought or product of the number ten", but this explanation is equally inadequate.[599]

i. i]. On the same analogy upwards to 20. The form עֶשְׂרִים is for עֲשָׂרִים. The plural rather than the dual is used

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

here, because the tens of the units upward (30, 40 etc.) have their own respective designations, and the specification of duality was therefore not necessary here.[601]

j. j]. The tens from twenty to ninety are plur. forms, with ־ִים terminations, of the units, e. g. שְׁלֹשִׁים, אַרְבָּעִים, etc. The remaining numerals upwards are: מֵאָה, מָאתַיִם, שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת, אַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת, etc., אֶלֶף, רְבָבָה, or רִבּוֹ and רִבּוֹא, רִבּוֹתַיִם Ps 68:18. These numerals are the same for both masculine and feminine substantives. Some occur also with suffixes, e. g. חֲמִשֶּׁיךָ 2K 1:10.12, אֲלָפַי Ju 6:15, אֲלָפָיו and רִבְבֹתָיו 1S 18:7. אֶלֶף is sometimes employed in a collective sense, e. g. שִׁשָּׁה עָשָׂר אֶלֶף Nu 31:40.46, מֵאָה אֶלֶף 1K 20:29.

k. The numerals generally occur in the construct form, preceding the substantive (the object numbered), which is in the genitive, e. g. שְׁנֵי אֲנָשִׁים Ex 2:13, עֲשֶׂרֶת בְּנֵי הָמָן Es 9:10, לְאַלְפֵי רְבָבָה Gn 24:60 (with numeral as substantive). There are, however, instances of the reverse order, viz., with the substantive in the construct form, preceding the substantive in the genitive, e. g. בִּשְׁנַת אַחַת Dn 11:1, בִּשְׁנַת שָׁלֹשׁ ibid 8:1, בִּשְׁנַת שְׁתַּיִם 2K 1:17.[602]

l. The definite article is preformed to the genitive, whether it is another numeral as in בִּשְׁנֵים הֶעָשָׂר 1K 19:19 (but also הָאַחַת עֶשְׂרֵה ibid 6:38), or a substantive, e. g. שְׁנֵי הָאֲנָשִׁים Jos 2:4, שְׁתֵּים עֶשְׂרֵה הָאֲבָנִים ibid 4:3, שֶׁבַע הַפָּרוֹת Gn 41:4, אַרְבָּעִים הַיּוֹם Dt 9:25, etc. In a series of numerals in the absolute forms the definite article is preformed either to the first or to all the numerals in the series, e. g. הָאֶחָד וְעֶשְׂרִים לַחֹדֶשׁ Ex 12:18, הַחֲמִשִּׁים וּמָאתַיִם Nu 16:35 (but also הָאֶלֶף וּשְׁבַע הַמֵּאוֹת וַחֲמִשָּׁה וְשִׁבְעִים Ex 38:28), הַשְּׁלֹשָׁה וְהַשִּׁבְעִים וְהַמָּאתַיִם Nu 3:46.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

m The numerals have also various nominal, adjectival, and verbal derivatives, e. g. מִשְׁנֶה Zc 9:12, 2K 23:4, Gn 43:12 (where the Segol under the Nun is indicative of its being an adjective), שְׁנוּ וַיִּשְׁנוּ 1K 18:34; שָׁלִישׁ (who is the third in official rank under the king) 2K 7:2, plur. שָׁלִישִׁים Ex 14:7, שִׁלֵּשִׁים ibid 20:5 (of a different formation and meaning), שִׁלְשׁוֹם Gn 31:2.5 (adv.), וְשִׁלַּשְׁתָּ 1S 20:19 (verb); רִבֵּעִים Ex 20:5, רֹבַע Nu 23:10, רָבוּעַ Ex 27:1 and מְרֻבַּעַת Ez 40:47; וַחֲמֻשִׁים Ex 13:18,[602a] חִמֵּשׁ Gn 41:34; וְשִׁשִּׁיתֶם Ez 45:13; עָשׂוֹר with reference to a ten-stringed instrument (Ps 33:2) or ten months (Gn 24:55), יַעְשֹׂר 1S 8:15.17 עַשֵּׂר תְּעַשֵּׂר Dt 14:22, and לַעְשֵׂר (for לְהַעְשֵׂר)[603] ibid 26:12; מַאֲלִיפוֹת מְרֻבָּבוֹת Ps 144:13.

n. The numerals do not always denote a definite number; they are sometimes employed in the sense of "a few" or "a large number", e. g. שְׁנַיִם שְׁלֹשָׁה Is 17:6 and 2K 9:32, meaning "a few", while שֶׁבַע יִפֹּל צַדִּיק Pr 24:16, שֶׁבַע כְּחַטֹּאתֵיכֶם Lv 26:21, עֶשֶׂר פְּעָמִים Jb 19:3 connote multitude.

§ 70. Ordinal Numbers

a. רִאשׁוֹן, שֵׁנִי (on its form see above § 51g), שְׁלִישִׁי, רְבִיעִי, חֲמִשִּׁי, שִׁשִּׁי, שְׁבִיעִי, שְׁמִינִי, תְּשִׁיעִי, עֲשִׂירִי. In the feminine form the ending ִ—ית or ִ—יָּה is afformed, and they are employed also to express fractions, e. g. רְבִיעִית Nu 15:6 (also רֶבַע הַהִין Ex 29:40), חֲמִשִׁית Gn 47:24, (also חֹמֶשׁ ibid 47:26), עֲשִׂירִית Ex 16:36 (also עִשָּׂרוֹן Lv 14:21, plur. עֶשְׂרֹנִים), etc. There are no special ordinal forms for numbers above ten. The cardinals are therefore used also for this purpose.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOTES: CHAPTER FOUR, G

[591] According to Ibn Ezra (*Yesod Mispar*, attached to Pinsker's *Mabo*, p. 133) אֶחָד occurs always when disconnected in sense, or when bearing a pausal accent (Athnaḥ or Sof Pasuḳ). So also Ges.-K. § 96: in close connection, אַחַד. But this view is untenable in the light of the many instances of אַחַד in disconnected discourse or with disjunctive accents.

[592] So Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 21) and Ibn Ezra (op. cit. 136), also the moderns. The feminine numerals אַחַת and אַחַת are analogous both in form and in usage to the msaculine אֶחָד and אַחַד (cf. Koenig II, 207).

[593] This etymology is quoted by Ibn Ezra (op. cit. 137) from a *Yesh Mefaresh*. This *Mefaresh* (exegete) is, according to Pinsker (note 14 ad loc.), Ibn Janaḥ (cf. loc. cit. 20). But Ibn Janaḥ himself (ibid.) attributes this opinion to others (אָמְרוּ בּוֹ).

[594] But according to Ibn Ezra (op. cit. 141) the Dagesh in the ת of שְׁתַּיִם is Dagesh forte and compensates for the loss of the Nun, the original form being שְׁנְתַּיִם, the feminine of שְׁנַיִם (cf. Arabic *thintāni*). This may also have been the opinion of Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 525: והתיו משתים לנקבה והנון מחוסרת). Other explanations of this unusual form are offered by Moshe ha-Naḳdan and Parḥon, quoted by Pinsker (*Mabo* 141, note 42). Pinsker himself maintains that the original reading was שְׁתַּי–שְׁתַּיִם, which is still found in the Babylonian MSS. (but see Strack's criticism in his adnot. to Is 6:2, in his edition of the Codex Babylonicus, and Philippi's refutation thereof in *ZDMG.*, XXXII, p. 85, note 5). This form, he maintains, was modified by the Palestinians and Tiberians, for euphonic reasons, to שְׁתַּיִם in script and אֶשְׁתַּיִם in pronunciation, with prosthetic א, like אֶתְמֹל and אֶזְרוֹעַ beside תְּמֹל and זְרוֹעַ (cf. above § 5a); cf. the Arabic *'ithnani*, also the Syriac שְׁתָּא and שְׁתִּין (for שִׁתָּא and שִׁתִּין) alongside of אֶשְׁתָּא and אֶשְׁתִּין. Barth (*Orient. Studien, Th. Noeldeke* . . . II, 792f.) explains the vocalization of שְׁתַּיִם, like Ḳimḥi, as due to assimilation to the masculine שְׁנַיִם; but he considers the Dagesh in the ת as forte, compensating for the missing Nun of שְׁנַיִם, from which the feminine form originates. Cf. also Ges.-K. § 97b, note 1.

[595] Our text reads שְׁלֹשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה. In all other examples of the construct

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

state, even with Maḳḳef, the form שְׁלֹשׁ occurs, with the exception of שְׁלָשׁ־אֵלֶּה Ex 21:11.

[596] Ibn Ezra (comment. ad loc.) likewise regards the Mem as a preformative. But some of the moderns take it as a preposition (מִן) in the sense of approximation (cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v.). On the ending ־ָה in the masculine numerals above "two", see Barth, *Pronominalbildung* 87; also Speiser, *AJOS.*, LVI, 1, 39.

[597] More probably שִׁבְעַת (cf. אַרְבַּעַת). So Ibn Ezra in *Yesod Mispar* (Pinsker's *Mabo* 160). It is thus a segolatized form of a masculine שִׁבְעָה* (cf. עֶשְׂרֶת — עֲשָׂרָה), the feminine of which would be שְׁבַע*, the latter being perhaps the basis of the feminine construct שְׁבַע; cf. also Bauer-Leander 620.

[598] Cf. above, note 523. According to Ewald § 269c שִׁבְעָנָה is an old feminine collective substantive in the sense of "a set of seven" (cf. the German "ein Duzend"). Koenig II, 209, contrues it as a forma mixta, composed of שִׁבְעָן, contracted from the dual שִׁבְעַיִן (cf. Targum ad loc.: אַרְבְּסַר) and שִׁבְעָה. Others regard it as a scribal error; cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v. and Bauer-Leander, op. cit.

[599] Pinsker (note 188 to Ibn Ezra's *Yesod Mispar*) brings also an opinion of Ibn Janaḥ, found in a MS. in possession of Luzzatto, to the effect that עַשְׁתֵּי is derived from עַד and שְׁתֵּי. Ḳimḥi's objection, however, probably taken from Ibn Ezra (op. cit. 167 and Ṣ. 41b), is still pertinent. See also Pinsker's note 195 on *Yesod Mispar*. Modern grammarians refer עַשְׁתֵּי to Assyro-Babylonian *ishtēn*, the common word for "one" (cf. Koenig II, 212 and Ges.-K. § 97e, note 1). The form עַשְׁתֵּי is then in place of עַשְׁתֵּין or עַשְׁתִּים, cf. שְׁנֵי עָשָׂר alongside of שְׁנֵים עָשָׂר.

[600] According to Pinsker (op. cit. 142, note 46) the form שְׁנֵים עָשָׂר is a kind of compromise between שְׁנֵי עָשָׂר (on the analogy of אַחַד עָשָׂר), six examples of which are found in the Bible, and שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר (analogous to שְׁלֹשָׁה עָשָׂר, etc.); while שְׁתֵּים עֶשְׂרֵה is the result of assimilation to שְׁנֵים עָשָׂר. Another possible explanation is that שְׁנֵים עָשָׂר and שְׁתֵּים עֶשְׂרֵה represent a normal contraction of the absolutes שְׁנַיִם and שְׁתַּיִם in close connexion with עָשָׂר and עֶשְׂרֵה, in order to facilitate the pronunciation; cf. Ges.-K. § 97d.

[601] עֶשְׂרִים is, accordingly, a plural form, like the following decimal groups, שְׁלֹשִׁים, etc. But Ibn Ezra (op. cit. 169) apparently takes it as a dual for עֶשְׂרַיִם. Some of the modern grammarians, likewise, trace עֶשְׂרִים back to a dual *'asra* (= Akkad. *eshra*, Ethiop. *'eshra*), in which the tone-less *ă* became attenuated by assimilation to *i*, and the plur.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

affirmative replaced the dual owing to the influence of the plural forms of the following decimal groups, שְׁלֹשִׁים . . . שִׁבְעִים, תִּשְׁעִים; cf. Brock. *GvG.* I, 252; Bauer-Leander 626. But Koenig II, 214f. rejects any possibility of a dual in עֶשְׂרִים as unnecessary and without analogy. The peculiarity of the plural forms עֶשְׂרִים, שִׁבְעִים, and תִּשְׁעִים (for עֶשְׂרִים, שִׁבְעִים, and תִּשְׁעִים) can be explained as due to the survival of the original plurals of the Segolates (cf. Bauer-Leander 571). See also above, note 452.

[602] These may be taken merely as formal genitives, analogous to such forms as בִּגְדֵי קֹדֶשׁ, אֲרוֹן עֵץ, אֶרֶץ כְּנַעַן, etc.; cf. Ges.-K. 435, note 2.

[602a] Cf. *Shor.* s. v., where Ḳimḥi interprets this form in the sense of חֲגוּרֵי חֹמֶשׁ *those wearing arms on the fifth rib.* So also Ibn Ezra ad loc. and Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 161). The latter adduces the analogy of חֲלוּצִים Dt 3:18 in the sense of חֲגוּרִים עַל חֲלָצַיִם *those wearing arms on the loins.*

[603] So Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 390), Ibn Ezra (op. cit. 166) and some of the modern grammarians (cf. Koenig II, 278, and Bauer-Leander 228 and 353). But according to Barth § 69 this form, as well as בְּעַשֵּׂר Ne 10:39, is an Infinitive of the Ḳal with *i*-Imperfect. A similar explanation, but couched in medieval terminology is that suggested by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit.); namely, that both בְּעַשֵּׂר and לְעַשֵּׂר are Ḳal Infinitives of the יִקְטֵל formation, in which the Ṣere is in place of Pathaḥ, although the יִקְטַל (יַעְשֹׂר) also occurs. Ben Naftali reads לְעַשֵּׂר in Dt 26:12, and on this ground Ibn Ezra (op. cit.) regards it as possible to construe this instance as Pi'el. So also some of the moderns; cf. Ges.-K. § 53k and Ges.-Buhl s. v. See also above, note 278.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

CHAPTER V, THE PARTICLES[604]

§ 71. General View

a. The particles are auxiliares of the verbs and the nouns and serve to indicate the syntactical relationship between *these* more clearly and definitely.

§ 72. Adverbs

a. Some of the adverbial particles occur in connection with suffixes, e. g. אַ֫יִן, in pause אָ֫יִן Ju 4:20 (but also וָאָ֫יִן Jb 3:9 and Ps 69:21 in pause); with suffixes אֵינֶ֫נִּי (mishnic אֵינִי) first person sing., אֵינְךָ—ךְ 2nd pers. sing., אֵינֶ֫נּוּ (mishnic אֵינוֹ) and אֵינֶ֫נָּה 3rd pers. sing., אֵינֶ֫נּוּ first pers. plur., אֵינְכֶם—ן 2nd pers. plur., אֵינָם—ן 3rd pers. plural. The Ṣere is retained without the suffixes only in close connexion with the following word (but see also וְאִין יֵשׁ 1S 21:9).[605]

b. הֵן (or הֶן־ before Maḳḳef connecting it with a tone-syllable), with pleonastic ה, הִנֵּה (but הִנֶּה נָּא Gn 19:2 on account of the Dagesh, see above § 7g), with suffixes הִנְנִי or הִנֵּנִי (also הִנֵּנִי Gn 22:7 and ibid 27:18), הִנֵּךְ, הִנָּךְ Gn 6:11, הִנְנוּ Jr 3:22 (also הִנֵּנוּ Gn 44:16 Nu 14:40, and with first Nun Rafe, הִנֵּנוּ Jb 38:35 [in our text הִנֵּנוּ]).

c. יֵשׁ (יֶשׁ־ before a tone-syllable with Maḳḳef), with suffixes יֶשְׁי, יֶשְׁךָ, יֶשְׁנוֹ Es 3:8 (also יֶשְׁוֹ [יֶשׁוֹ] or יֶשׁוֹ, on the

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

analogy of בְּנוֹ which is of kindred origin),[606] יֶשְׁם [יֶשְׁם] or יֶשְׁכֶם, יֶשְׁם or יֶשְׁכֶם Dt 13:4.

d. אֵי, with pleonastic ה, אַיֵּה, with suffixes אַיּוֹ, אַיֶּכָּה or אֵיךְ, אַיִּי or אַיֵּהוּ, אַיֵּה, אֵינֶנּוּ, אַיֶּכֶם—ן, אַיָּם—ן.[607] עוֹד, with suffixes עוֹדֶנִּי, עוֹדְךָ, fem. עוֹדָךְ 1K 1:14, עוֹדֶנּוּ עוֹדֶנָּה, etc. [on the "pleonastic" Nun in these instances, as well as in אֵינֶנִּי, etc., see above, note 383].

e. Other adverbial particles are: אָז, עַתָּה, הֵנָּה, אָנָה (but אָנָה Dt 1:28 and Ps 139:7, with the tone on the ultima)[608] כֵּן, לֹא, אֵיךְ, אֵיכָה, אֵיכָכָה, מָתַי, פֹּה, דַּי (with prefixes מִדֵּי Is 66:23 and בְּדֵי Jb 39:25).

f. The interrogative particle ה is vocalized as follows:[609]

(a) Usually with Ḥaṭef Pathaḥ, e. g. הֲשֹׁפֵט Gn 18:25, הֲנִמְצָא ibid 41:38, הֲמִבְּלִי 2K 1:3[a] (but הֲיִיטַב Lv 10:19 is irregular)

g. (b) Before a consonant with Shewa this particle takes Pathaḥ, which is sometimes followed by Dagesh, e. g. הַבְּרָב־כֹּחַ Jb 23:6, הַכְּתֹנֶת בִּנְךָ Gn 37:32, הַבְּמַחֲנִים Nu 13:19. In הַרְּאִיתֶם 1S 10:24 and 2K 6:32 the Dagesh in the ר is exceptional [Cf. above note 58]. In a considerable number of instances, however, the ה interrogativum is not followed by Dagesh, e. g. הַבְסוֹד Jb 15:8,[611] הַמְשֹׁל Ju 9:2, הַכְזוֹנָה Gn 34:31 הַבְרָכָה ibid 27:38 [in our text הַבְּרָכָה; so also in *Okhla ve-Okhla*, no. 65], הַמְעָרַת Jr 7:11, also הַשְׁכַחְתֶּם ibid 44:9 in some Mss.

a. But הֲמִבְּלִי Ex 14:11 is read by Ibn Janaḥ [*Riḳ.* 167 and 222] with Pathaḥ under the ה, while under the ה of הלְמַעַנְךָ Jb 18:4 and הֲמֵעִמְּךָ ibid 34:33 he reads Ḥaṭef Pathaḥ. This reading, however, is not borne out by all authentic Mss, except the Jerusalem Ms, on which Ibn Janaḥ bases his readings. We read Ḥaṭef Pathaḥ under the ה of הֲמִבְּלִי and Pathaḥ with Ga'ya under that of הַלְמַעַנְךָ and הַמֵעִמְּךָ.[610]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

h. (c) Before a laryngeal it takes Pathaḥ, e. g. הַחִיִּיתֶם Nu 31:15 הַעֶבֶד Jr 2:14, הַעַיִט ibid 12:9, הַאֹרַח Jb 22:15, etc.

i. (d) Before a laryngeal pointed with Ḳameṣ the ה takes Segol, for the sake of euphony, e. g. הֶהָשֵׁב Gn 24:5, הֶאָנֹכִי Nu 11:12, הֶאָמֹר Ez 28:9 and ibid 18:23 [see above, § 9h].

§ 73. Conjunctions and Interjections

a. [To this category belong the prefixed prepositions כ and ו (cf. on their function below § 75 and on their vocalization above §§ 11 and 21)] זוּלָתִי, בִּלְעֲדֵי, רַק, לְמַעַן, לוּ, לוּלֵי, לָכֵן, בִּלְתִּי, אֶפֶס and the interjections הִנֵּה, הֵן (and with Segol under the Nun in הִנֶּה נָּא Gn 19:2 and in הִנֶּנִּי 22:7, on account of the Dagesh in the following Nun); נָא, and אָנָּא (but also אָנָּה Ps 116:16, etc., six examples of which occur according to the Masora).[612]

§ 74. Prepositions

a. אֵת, before a Maḳḳef the Ṣere changes to Segol (but אֵת־כֹּל Jb 41:26 remains unchanged), also without Maḳḳef in three places: אֶת גְּאוֹן־ Ps 47:5, אֶת ארם נהרים ibid 60:2, אֶת אשר יאהב Pr 3:12. It is employed in two meanings: (1) to denote and define the accusative,[a] (2) in place of עִם (with).[612a]

a. It is also used in the nominative sense,[613] e. g. יֵחָלֵק אֶת הארץ Nu 26:55, יוּמַת נָא אֶת האיש הזה Jr 38:4, הוּקַם את דברי יהונדב ibid 35:14. On the other hand, where the accusative is clearly definite, the אֶת particle is omitted, e. g. בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אָדָם Dt 4:32 מַיִם תִּבְעֶה אֵשׁ Is 64:1, אֲבָנִים שָׁחֲקוּ מַיִם Jb 14:19, etc. A ל is sometimes prefixed to the accusative, in place of אֶת, e. g. הָרְגוּ לְאַבְנֵר 2S 3:30.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

b. The inflexions in the first instance are: —

	singular	plural
1. c	אוֹתִי	אוֹתָנוּ
2 m	אוֹתְךָ pause אוֹתָךְ[a]	אֶתְכֶם[b]
2 f	אוֹתָךְ	אֶתְכֶן
3 m	אתוֹ	אֶתְהֶם, אוֹתָם
3 f	אוֹתָהּ	אֶתְהֶן אֹתָן[c]

c. The inflexions in the second instance are: אִתִּי, אִתְּךָ, אִתָּךְ (or אִתַּךְ Is 54:10), אִתּוֹ, אִתָּהּ, אִתָּנוּ, אִתְּכֶם–ן, אִתָּם–ן.

d. אֶל, the plural form is אֱלֵי Jb 29:19.[614] The suffixes are appended to the latter form with Ṣere under the א, except with grave suffixes (כֶם–ן, הֶם–ן), when the א takes compound Shewa, e. g. אֵלַי, אֵלֶיךָ, אֵלָיו, אֵלֵינוּ, אֲלֵיכֶם [אֲלֵיכֶם–ן], etc. Similarly עַל, plur. form עֲלֵי Nu 24:6, with suffixes עָלַי, עָלֶיךָ, עֲלֵיכֶם–ן, etc.; also בִּלְעֲדֵי, with suffixes בִּלְעָדַי, בִּלְעָדֵינוּ, בִּלְעֲדֵיכֶם–ן, etc. The form בִּלְעָדַי Gn 14:24 is analogous to וַחֲשׂוּפַי Is 20:4 and חוֹרָי ibid 10:19 (cf. above § 45d).[615] In הֲמִבַּלְעֲדֵי ibid 36:10 the מ is pleonastic.

e. Other prepositions with suffixes are: אֶפֶס, inflected like the noun of the same formation, e. g. וְאַפְסִי Is 47:8.10; בִּלְתִּי, with suffixes בִּלְתְּךָ, etc.; בֵּין, with suffixes בֵּינִי, בֵּינְךָ, etc., also in the plural בֵּינֵיכֶם וּבֵינָיו Jos 3:4, בֵּינוֹתֵינוּ בֵּינֵנוּ וּבֵינְךָ Gn 26:28, בֵּינוֹתָם[616] ibid 42:23; זוּלָתִי[d], with pleo-

a. אוֹתְכָה in Ex 29:35 is with pleonastic ה.

b. Also אוֹתְכֶם Jos 23:15.

c. With pleonastic ה. אוֹתָנָה Ex 35:26, also אוֹתְהֶן Ez 23:47, אוֹתְהֶם ibid 23:45, and with suffix ם for נ in אוֹתָם Ju 19:24.

d. The preposition בֵּין is used before both nouns referred to, e. g. בֵּין הַקֹּדֶשׁ וּבֵין הַחוֹל וגו' Lv 10:10, בֵּינֵנוּ וּבֵינֵיכֶם Jos 22:25, 27.28, but

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

nastic Yod זוּלָתִי,[617] with suffixes זוּלָתִי, זוּלָתְךָ, זוּלָתֵנוּ, זוּלָתָם, etc.; מִן (also מִנֵּי Is 30:11 and מִנִּי Ju 5:14).[a] with suffixes מִמֶּנִּי or מִנִּי Is 22:4, מִמֶּךָּ, מִמֶּנּוּ (both for the third person sing.[b] and the first person plural),[619] מִכֶּם, מֵהֶן, etc.; עִם, with suffixes עִמִּי,[c] also עִמָּדִי,[620] עִמְּךָ, עִמָּךְ Gn 28:15, etc.; תּוֹךְ, with suffixes תּוֹכִי, etc. (תּוֹכֲהֶנָה Ez 16:53 is for תּוֹכָן, or it is a combination of תּוֹכָה and תּוֹכָן); בִּגְלַל; בַּעֲבוּר; and לְמַעַן which take suffixes regularly.

§ 75. Prefixed Prepositions

a. The preposition מִן mentioned in the preceding paragraph occurs as a prefix with the Nun assimilated by means of Dagesh to the following consonant, to which it is appended. This Dagesh is omitted irregularly in מִגְבוּרָתָם Ez 32:30, מִבְצִיר Ju 8:2, מִלְאוֹם Gn 25:23. It occurs also with Pathaḥ under the Mem, e. g. לְמַבָּרִאשׁוֹנָה 1Chr 15:13, לְמַדַּי 2Chr 30:3, מַחְמָאוֹת [in our text מַחֲמָאוֹת] Ps 55:22.[621] The initial consonant Yod quiesces after the Mem and consequently lengthens its vowel to long Ḥireḳ, e. g. מִידֵי Gn 49:24, מִימִין Zc 4:3, מִיגוֹנָם Jr 31:13 (מִיְּשֵׁנֵי Dn 12:2 and מִיְּרֻשָּׁתְךָ 2 Chr 20:11 are exceptions). Before a laryngeal, also sometime before ר, the Ḥireḳ of the מ is lengthened to Ṣere, e. g. מֵעֶרֶב Lv 23:32, מֵהֶבֶל Pr 13:11, מֵחֶלֶד Ps 17:14, מֵחֲדוֹל 1S 12:23, מֵרוּחַ Ps 55:9, etc.; but the

the second בֵּין is sometimes replaced by the prefix לְ, e. g. בֵּין קֹדֶשׁ לְחוֹל Ez 44:23, בֵּין דָּם לְדָם בֵּין דִּין לְדִין Dt 17:8. In בְּבֵין Is 44:4 the prefix ב is for additional emphasis. [cf. *Riḳ*. 167].

a. The Dagesh in the Nun is due to the short Ḥireḳ under the Mem.

b. Also מִ נֶּ הוּ Ps 68:24 [in our text מִ נֵּ הוּ, see above § 46e and note 387][618] and מֶנְהוּ Jb 4:12.

c. The Dagesh in the Mem indicates its ע״ע derivation.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ḥireḳ remains before ח in the monosyllables מִחוּץ Lv 24:3 and מִחוּט Gn 14:23, before ה with simple Shewa in מֶהְיוֹת 1K 2:27 and מֶהְיוֹתָם Ḥag 2:16, and in several instances before ר as in מֵרָגְזְךָ Is 14:3, מִרְדוֹף 2S 18:16.[621a]

b. The prefixes בכל usually take simple Shewa and also occur independently with the suffix מוֹ, e. g. כְּמוֹ, בְּמוֹ, לְמוֹ.[622]

c. Before a laryngeal with a compound shewa they take the vowel corresponding to that under the laryngeal with which the shewa is compounded e. g. בֶּאֱכוֹל Nu 26:10 [in our text בַּאֲכוֹל], בַּעֲזוֹז Pr 8:28, בֶּאֱמוֹר Ez 36:20, כֶּאֱכוֹל Is 5:24, בֶּעֱנִי 1S 1:11, בֶּחֳרִי Ex 11:8, etc.; but in all instances of בָּאֲנָשִׁים, בָּאֲבָנִים (except 1S 17:12), בָּעֲלָטָה and בָּעֲרָבָה, the ב has Ḳameṣ. In לֵאלוֹהִים Ps 66:3, בֵּאלוֹהִים ibid 60:14, כֵּאלוֹהִים Gn 3:5 and always in לֵאמוֹר,[623] the א quiesces, in consequence of which the prefix takes Ṣere. The Pathaḥ and the Segol of the prefixes in לַחְמָם Is 47:14 and בֶּעְזוֹר 1Chr 15:26 indicate their being "hurried" forms (for לַחֲמָם and בֶּעֱזוֹר). The Pathaḥ under the ב in בַּעֱלִי Pr 27:22 and the Segol under the ל of לֶחֳדָשִׁים Is 47:13 are respectively unique.

d. When the initial consonant has Shewa these prefixes take Ḥireḳ in order to avoid the concurrence of two vocal Shewas. The inital Yod quiesces and coalesces with the Ḥireḳ of the prefixes, e. g. בִּיהוּדָה Ne 13:15, כִּיקַר Ps 37:20, etc. This occurs also even when the Yod is normally entitled to a vowel, in which case the prefix takes the vowel of the Yod, as in בִּיקְרוֹתֶיךָ (for בְּיִקְּרוֹתֶיךָ) [cf. above, note 28] Ps 45:10, לִיקְּהַת (for לְיִקְּהַת) Pr 30:17; also with Waw וִיחַלּוּ Jb 29:21 for וְיִחֲלוּ [so in our text], וִילְלַת Jr 25:36

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

(according to Ben Asher, for וְיִלְלַת), כִּיתְרוֹן Ec 2:13 for כְּיִתְרוֹן.

e. In אֲדֹנָי and all its forms and flexions [except אֲדֹנִי] the א quiesces after the prefixes בכלו with Pathaḥ, e. g. Gn 32:6, Nu 14:9, Dt 4:21, Jr 10:10, etc. The masoretic rule is משה מַפִּיק [Moses bring out, i. e. the prefixes משה make the א audible] וכלב לֹא מַפִּיק [and Kaleb does not bring out, i. e. the וכלב prefixes effect its quiescence].[a] This mnemonic rule has but one exception in case of משה and seven in that of וכלב.[624] A unique example is הַלְה' Dt 32:6, in which the He interrogativum has Pathah in place of Ḥaṭef Pathaḥ, and the ל takes Shewa mobile in place of Pathaḥ. The He interrogativum in this word is detached from the word. The reason for all this is the mystical significance of this word.[625]

f. The prefixes בכלו take Ḳameṣ immediately before the tone-syllable in the following cases:

(a) Before pronominal forms, e. g. לָכֶם–ן, כָּכֶם, בָּכֶם, בָּזֶה, לָהֶם–ן, כָּהֶם–ן, בָּהֶם–ן 1S 14:34, כָּזֹה וְכָזֶה 2S 11:25, לָזֹאת Jr 5:7 (but לְזֹאת Gn 2:23, כְּזֹאת ibid 45:23, בְּזֹאת Lv 16:3) [cf. *Riḳ.* 167 and above § 11b, also note 73].

g. (b) לָ before tone-syllables, e. g. לָמָּה La 1:1, לָצָו . . . לָקָו Is 28:10.13, לָטֹרַח ibid 1:14, לָנֶפֶשׁ Lv 19:28, וָרֹבּוּ Gn 49:23, וָדֶשֶׁן Ps 63:6.

h. ((c) With the interrogative particle מה, the ב and the כ are pointed with Pathaḥ, followed by Dagesh, e. g. בַּמָּה Gn 15:8, כַּמָּה ibid 47:8 and Ps 78:40 (also with Shewa בְּמָה Ec 3:22 [in our text בַּמֶּה]). The ל, however, when

a. This rule also implies that the משה prefixes usually have vowels (but see above § 14), while the וכלב prefixes ordinarily have Shewa.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

appended to מה takes Ḳameṣ and bears the tone, while the מ has Dagesh; but before אהע the Mem attracts the tone and drops the Dagesh, e. g. Gn 12:19, Ps 22:2, etc. (exceptions 2S 2:22, Ps 49:6, Jr 15:18, 1S 28:15, 2S 14:31). Unusual are the forms לָמֶה 1S 1:8.

§ 76. Prepositions with Pronominal Suffixes

a. The בכל prefixes take pronominal suffixes and are inflected as follows:

(a) לְ[a] with pronominal suffixes

		Singular	Plur.
1st per.		לִי	לָנוּ
2nd per.	m.	לְךָ pause, לָךְ	לָכֶם
	f.	לָךְ	לָכֵנָה, לָכֶן Ez 13:18
3rd per.	m.	לוֹ	לָהֵמָּה, לָמוֹ, לָהֶם Jr 14:16
	f.	לָהּ	לָהֶן[b] also בָּהֵמָּה Ex 30:4, Ḥab 1:16

(b) כ with pronominal suffixes

		Singular	Plur.
1st per.		כָּמוֹנִי	כָּמוֹנוּ
2nd per.	m.	כָּמוֹךָ	כְּמוֹכֶם but כָּכֶם Jb 16:4 [in our text
	f.	[כָּמוֹךְ]	כְּמוֹכֶן כְּכֶם. So Baer in Jos 1:15, Ju 8:2, Ezr 4:2]
3rd per.	m.	כָּמוֹהוּ	כָּהֵם, כָּהֶם, כְּמוֹהֶם 2S 24:3
	f.	כָּמוֹהָ	כָּהֵן, כְּמוֹהֶן Ez 18:4 [in our text כָּהֶן]

a. So also בְּ.

b. There are 15 instances of בָּהֵן with Ṣere under the ה.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOTES: CHAPTER FIVE

[604] On the history of the Hebrew equivalent for this part of speech see above, note 3.

[605] Ḳimḥi apparently follows Ibn Janaḥ's second etymology (*Shor.* 25), according to which וְאַיִן is a contraction of אַיִן in the sense of הֲלֹא. So also some of the modern grammarians (Ewald § 146e, Stade § 194c). The first etymology suggested by Ibn Janaḥ is that אין is in place of אִם. This etymology is accepted by Parḥon 4 and some of the moderns (cf. Ges.-K. 473, note 3). See also Koenig's elaborate treatment of this passage in *ZAW.*, XVIII, 239ff.

[606] Cf. above, note 566. יֶשְׁנוֹ may also have been assimilated in form to its antonym אֵינֶנּוּ or אֵינוֹ, cf. Bauer-Leander 634. In talmudic literature the form with Nun is widely used also with the plural suffixes ָ־ם–ן, e. g. יֶשְׁנָן, יֶשְׁנָם (cf. b. Pes. 43b and 91b, j. Sheḳ. 47a, etc.)

[607] The usage of this particle is more elaborately discussed by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 23f.) and Ibn Bal'am (*Noviye Materiali*, ed. Kokowzoff [text], 110). But the form with the suffix כֶם–ן is probably to be vocalized אֵיכֶם–ן.

[608] In both instances אָנָה is followed by a word beginning with א, hence the tone is shifted forward (see above § 37c and note 243). Normally, however, this ָ־ה suffix indicating direction is tone-less (cf. הֵנָּה, שָׁמָּה, הָלְאָה); cf. Koenig II, 259. The ground-form of אָנָה is thus אָן, a syncope of אַיִן; cf. Koenig ibid.; also above, note 50.

[609] These rules for the pointing of the interrogative Hē are taken in the main from Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.*, chapter 36). But the first two rules date back to Saadia (cf. *Agron*, ed. Harkavy, pp. 101f. and Dunash's *Tesh. ag. Saadia*, p. 34. Ḳimḥi himself seems to have originated rule (d).

[610] In our text of the *Riḳmah* (op. cit.) Ibn Janaḥ does not count the Hē interrogative of הַלְמַעַנְךָ among those pointed with Ḥatef Pathaḥ, while the Hē of הַמְעַטְךָ is pointed also in our text with Ḥaṭef Pathaḥ.

[611] Some texts read the ב with Dagesh. So also our text, but see *Minḥath Shai* ad loc. and *Ma'ase Efod* 167: במקצת ספרים הוא דגוש.

[612] The origin of this particle is disputed by both the ancient and the modern grammarians, since no analogies from the cognate languages can be adduced. Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit.) is uncertain whether the initial or

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the final א belongs to the stem. Ḳimḥi in *Shor.* s. אָן decides in favor of taking the initial א as the radical. So apparently also Ewald § 103h, according to whom אָנָּא evolved from אָן and gave rise to the detached נָא. Koenig II, 335, maintains, after Ges. *Lgb.* § 157, that אָנָּא is a syncope of אָהּ נָא, with the Dagesh in the Nun because of the tendency of this letter to self-duplication. But Samuel ha-Nagid (quoted by Ibn Ezra to Ex 32:31) construes it as a contraction of אַל נָא, with אַל in the sense of הואַל (consent). Similarly Boehme, *ZAW.*, II, 266 and Hitzig ad Is 38:3. The grammarians are likewise at variance with regard to the position of the tone in this word. According to Ḳimḥi (loc. cit.) the tone is on the penultima, but see *Minḥath Shai* to Ps 116:4; Pinsker, *Mabo* 184f.; and Koenig loc. cit. The latter definitely maintains that the retraction of the tone to the penultima in some cases of אָנָּא is due to a confusion thereof with אָנָה (whither) and that this confusion is also responsible for the six instances of אָנָּה with ה in place of א.

612a According to Eitan (*AJSL.*, XLV, 48f.) אֵת in the latter sense is entirely unrelated etymologically to the homonymous preposition in the former sense. In the sense of עִם, אֵת is derived, according to him, as a backward formation from אִתִּי<יָדְתִּי (from יָד+תִּי, cf. שְׁשָּׁה<שִׁרְשָׁה), in the sense of ***hand*** or ***side***. He adduces plausible proof to substantiate this etymology.

613 Cf. Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 51) and Ibn Bal'am (*Noviye Materiali*, ed. Kokowzoff [text], 115). The latter gives a particularly elaborate account of the use of אֵת in this sense, and he adduces numerous illustrative examples. See also Eitan, *AJSL.*, XLV, p. 50f.

614 But Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 30 and 369) regards the Yod in both אֱלֵי and עֲלֵי as pleonastic. In his *Shor.* s. v. Ḳimḥi construes the Yod in both instances as a radical in place of ה. So also most of the modern grammarians, who adduce the analogy of the Arabic *'ilā*, *'alā*. But Lagarde (cf. references in Ges.-K. 304, note 1) takes this Yod as a plural characteristic.

615 So Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 9), Ibn Bal'am (op. cit. 117) and, apparently, Ibn Ezra ad loc. But some of the moderns take the Yod as a first person sing. suffix in the sense of "regardless of me" (cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v.).

616 According to Eitan (loc. cit. 52) בֵּינוֹתָם is a compound of בֵּין אוֹתָם and בֵּינוֹתֵינוּ of בֵּין אוֹתָנוּ, with the change in the latter before the pronominal suffix נו due to the analogical influence of the nominal plurals ending in וֹת– (or even in ים–ֵ), examples of which can be adduced from other Semitic languages.

617 So Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit.), Ibn Bal'am (op. cit. 119), and Ibn Ezra

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

(*Moz.* 15b) with regard to both בִּלְתִּי and זוּלָתִי. Some of the modern grammarians derive בִּלְתִּי from the stem בלה (Koenig II, 168) and construe the Ḥireḳ as Ḥireḳ campaginis, which is common in the construct state (cf. Ges.-K. § 90 l). According to Luzzatto (cf. letter attached to *Kiḳma*) זוּלָתִי is to be traced back to זו לא (cf. לוּלֵי and לוּלֵא for לוּ לֹא) and בִּלְתִּי to בְּלִי (for בְּלֹא), while זוּלַת is a back formation. The same etymology of these two particles is suggested by Eitan (*AJSL.*, XLIV, 258 f.), without reference to Luzzatto.

[618] This is also the reading of Baer, and it is construed by some of the moderns (cf. Ges.-K. § 103m) as a substantive (<מָן *portion*).

[619] According to Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 112) the Dagesh in the Nun of מִנִּי compensates for another missing Nun, the form in full being מִנְנִי, with the pronominal suffix נִי for the first person, as in תְּחִתֵּנִי 2S 32:27. This is also the opinion of Ibn Ezra, who further maintains that the Dagesh in the מ of מִמֶּנִּי compensates for the missing Nun of מִן (cf. Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc., pp. 113 and 150, also commentary to Ex 1:9). In מִמֶּנּוּ, third person sing. and first person plur., the Dagesh of the Nun in the former instance is explained by Ibn Ezra (loc. cit.) as due, just as in מִמֶּנִּי, to the loss of another Nun, the full form being מִנְמֶנְנוּ, with נוּ as the first person plur. suffix, while in the latter case the Dagesh compensates for the ה of the suffix הוּ of the third person sing. as in יִשְׁמְרֵהוּ, יִשְׁמְרֶנּוּ, etc. On the supposed Babylonian reading מִמֶּנוּ for the first person plur. recorded by Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Saadia* 36), Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit.), Ibn Bal'am (*Noviye Materiali*, ed. Kokowzoff [text], 125), and Ibn Ezra (loc. cit.), which was apparently also familiar to the talmudists (cf. Sota 35a: אל תקרי ממנו אלא ממנו), see Geiger, *Kerem Ḥemed* IX, 69ff.; Pinsker, *Mabo* 2; Poznański, *Anonymous Grammar*, note 69. Of the explanations given by modern grammarians of these forms that of Lambert (*REJ.*, XXIII, 302ff.) is, perhaps, the most plausible; namely, that they have arisen from מִנֶּנִּי, etc. and that the forms of the suffixes evolved on the analogy of אֵינֶנִּי, עוֹדֶנּוּ, תְּחִתֶּנָּה.

[620] This is probably analogous to the Arabic *'inda* (beside, with); cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v. The change of Nun to Mem may be attributed to the influence of the synonymous עִם (cf. Koenig II, 461). Ḳimḥi comments on this particle that it is questionable whether the other persons, except the first, of this particle may be formed (*Mikhlol*, ed. Lyk, p. 193b). But on another occasion (ibid. 121b) he quotes his father as having justified the use of this particle in all persons.

[621] So Ibn Janaḥ (*Shor.* 108 and 158). מֵחֲמָאוֹת is therefore in place of מַחֲמָאוֹת. So also Ibn Ezra ad loc. and the Targum. Rashi, however,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

takes the מ as a preformative, like that in מַאֲמָר and מַעֲשֶׂה. The moderns are, likewise, divided in their opinions. Some adopt the former, others the latter etymology (see Delitzsch, Baethgen, and Duhm ad loc.).

[621a] So on page 48a in the text, ed. Lyk; but on page 38b in the same edition he reads Ṣere under the מ. Some read here מְדָרֵךְ, cf. Ges.-K. § 22s.

[622] This suffix is according to the moderns obscured from מה and is a remnant of a substantive with the meaning of *matter*, *kind*; cf. Ges.-K. § 102c and Ges.-Buhl s. v.

[623] Thus, the Segol of the normal forms לֵאלֹהִים etc., לֵאמֹר (cf. לֶאְסֹר Ps 149:8 changed to the corresponding long vowel Ṣere after the א quiesced and the Segol remained in an open unaccented syllable; cf. Aram. יֵאכֻל<יֶאֱכֻל. See above, note 201.

[624] Cf. Ḥayyuj (N. 19), Talmide Dunash (*Tesh.* 42), and Ginsburg's *Massora* I, 23. The mnemonic formula given here by Ḳimḥi is ascribed by Luzzatto to Ibn Bal'am (*Igroth* I, 1230), while the more familiar formula משה מוציא וכלב מכנים was found by Luzzatto (ibid.) among the grammatical rules attached to the Venice Bible, published in 1678. The exception in the case of משה מַפִּיק is found in Jr 8:19, while the seven exceptions in that of וכלב לא מפיק are: Gn 40:1, Dt 10:17, 1K 1:11, Am 4:1, Ps 135:5 and 136:3, Ne 8:10. All exceptions of the latter category have אֲדוֹנָי as the basal form.

[625] Cf. Norzi (*Minḥath Shai* ad loc.), but according to his text of this passage in the *Mikhlol*, which is also that of the Fürth edition, the Shewa under the ל is silent, and that under the Yod, representing the א of אֲדֹנָי, is mobile. This presupposes then a Shewa under the Yod, which is not found in our text. Furthermore, the reading in the Lyk edition (40b), on which the present translation is based, seems more plausible, for if the Hē is standing alone (יְהִידָה) entirely detached from ליהוה, as was observed also by other early grammarians and masoretic students, it is not likely that Ḳimḥi would consider the Shewa under the ל beginning a word as silent. This unique form points, according to Olshausen, to the origin of the interrogative particle הַל (Arabic *hal*) and the separation may be due to a protest against admitting it into Hebrew (cf. Ges.-K. 296[1]); but see Ewald 227, note and Koenig II, 242.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

CHAPTER VI. SYNTACTICAL REMARKS

§ 77. On the Tenses

a. The distinction of tenses in Hebrew is not consistently pursued. Thus the Perfect and the Imperfect frequently interchange [*Riḳ.* 187], while both the Perfect and the Imperfect are sometimes used in place of the Present (participle).[626]

b. The Perfect is particularly common in place of the Imperfect in the prophetic style, where the event or action is imminent beyond any doubt in the mind of the speaker or writer and is already regarded as accomplished. The Imperfect is often used in the past sense after אָז, e. g. אָז יָשִׁיר Ex 15:1 and Nu 21:17. The same holds true in Arabic, according to Ibn Ezra, who further maintains that Hebrew has no Present tense,[627] but that it employs the Perfect and the Imperfect to express action in the Present,[628] e. g. יְכַסֶּה Is 6:2, וַיָּנֻעוּ ibid 6:4. Thus we find the Perfect form in אִישׁ הָרַגְתִּי Gn 4:23 for the Future Present (expressing recurrent or repetitive action in the Future) in place of אֶהֱרוֹג or הָיִיתִי הוֹרֵג (I would kill him) and the Imperfect תַּסִּיעַ . . . תְּגָרֵשׁ Ps 80:9 for the Past Present (expressing the same type of action in the Past).[629] The Present tense [participle], however, is never employed for the Perfect or the Imperfect. The instance of וּפַרְעֹה חוֹלֵם Gn 41:1 and אֲנִי עֹשֶׂה Is 66:22, adduced by Ibn Janaḥ [*Riḳ.* 187] in proof to the contrary is irrelevant, for these

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

are essentially forms of the [Past] Present, the former in the meaning of הָיָה חוֹלֶם,[630] the latter in the sense that God is constantly creating and maintaining His creation by His power.

c. The Imperfect and the Imperative also interchange,[631] e.g. עֲלֵה...וּמֻת Dt 32:50 (for וְתָמוּת), שִׂים קִנֶּךָ Ob 1:4 (for תָּשִׂים), אֲשֶׁר תְּנָה Ps 8:2 (for תִּתֵּן),[632] רַחֲקִי Is 54:14 (for תִּרְחֲקִי), etc. Examples of Imperfect forms for Imperatives are too numerous and obvious to require citation.

§ 78. On the Infinitive

a. The Infinitive denotes an action in the abstract sense and is implied as the underlying thought in all verbs in the various tenses and moods.[633] It is therefore employed to express any of the three tenses, the Perfect, the Present [participle] and the Imperfect, also the Imperative [cf. *Rik.* 188] e. g. רָצוֹא וָשׁוֹב Ez 1:14 (for רָצוּ וְשָׁבוּ or רָצִים וְשָׁבִים), יָלְדָה וְעָזוֹב Jr 14:5 (for יָלְדָה וְעָזְבָה), הָלוֹךְ וְחָסוֹר Gn 8:5 (for הוֹלְכִים הָלוֹךְ וְחָסֵרִים חָסוֹר), הוֹשִׁיעַ 2S 3:18 (for אוֹשִׁיעַ), הוֹצִיא Ez 11:7 (for אוֹצִיא), וּבְעֵת קַבְּצִי Ze 3:20 (for אֲקַבֵּץ וּבְעֵת הַהִיא), הִשָּׁבַע שְׁבוּעָה Nu 30:3 (for יִשָּׁבַע שְׁבוּעָה), וְהַאֲזִין Ps 77:2 (for וְיַאֲזִין), זָכוֹר Ex 20:8 (for זְכוֹר), שָׁמוֹר Dt 5:12 (for שְׁמוֹר), הָלוֹךְ וְקָרָאתָ Jr 2:2 (for לֵךְ וְקָרָאתָ), etc.[634]

b. The Infinitive also has a nominal connotation. It therefore combines with the corresponding finite verb to strengthen the idea represented by it, without, however, agreeing with this verb in conjugation [*Rik.* 189], e. g. טָרֹף טֹרַף Gn 37:33, עָרוֹם יַעְרִים 1S 23:22, קַטֵּר יַקְטִירוּן ibid 2:16, מוֹט הִתְמוֹטְטָה Is 24:19, כָּשׁוֹל יִכָּשֵׁלוּ ibid 40:30,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

הָחֳרֵב נֶחֶרְבוּ 2K 3:23, וְהָחְתֵּל לֹא חֻתָּלְתְּ Ez 16:4, etc.[635] The Infinitive usually precedes the finite verb, but follows it in the Imperative [*Moz.* 48b] e.g. שִׁמְעוּ שָׁמוֹעַ Is 6:9, בְּכוּ בָכֹה Jr 22:10, אֹורוּ אָרוֹר Ju 5:23. [Cf. below § 80 and note 639]

c. The Infinitive, because of its nominal connotation, is used as a subject with the predicate either in the masculine or in the feminine gender, e. g. רַע וָמָר עָזְבֵךְ את ה' אֱלֹהָיִךְ Jr 2:19, . . . הֲלוֹא זֹאת תַּעֲשֶׂה־לָּךְ עָזְבֵךְ ibid 2:17, הַנִּקְלָה, כִּי לֹא הָיְתָה מֵהַמֶּלֶךְ לְהָמִית . . . 1S 18:23, בְּעֵינֵיכֶם הִתְחַתֵּן 2S 3:37 [cf. Ges.-K. § 113b]. It also occurs with the plural endings characteristic of the nouns, e. g. בְּבְנוֹתַיִךְ Ez 16:31, בְּהִזָּרוֹתֵיכֶם ibid 6:8.[636]

d. The Infinitive and the noun occasionally interchange, e. g. עֲשֹׂה סֵטִים Ps 101:4 (for מַעֲשֵׂה), וּלְמַסַּע Nu 10:2, וּמִסְפָּר אֶת . . . ibid 23:10,[a] וּמִשְׁלוֹחַ Es 9:19.22, לְמַשְׂאוֹת Ez 17:9,[638] מִצֵּידוֹ Gn 27:30 (for וְלִשְׁלוֹחַ, וְלִסְפּוֹר, וּלְהַסִּיעַ, מִצּוּדוֹ, לְהַשִּׂיא).

e. The Infinitive is sometimes used in the transitive meaning, although the verb in the corresponding conjugation is used intransitively, e. g. עַד תֻּמִּי אוֹתָם Jr 27:8.

§ 79. On the Imperative

a. In addition to its ordinary use in expressing a simple command, the Imperative is employed also in the following cases:

a. The context, as well as the particle אֶת and the Ḳameṣ under the פ, preclude the possibility of its being a noun in the construct state.[637]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

(a) In an impersonal sense, e. g. רְאֵה רֵיחַ בְּנִי Gn 27:27, אֱמֹר לַמֶּלֶךְ וְלַגְּבִירָה Jr 13:18 [in our text אֱמֹר], חַזְּקוּ יָדַיִם רָפוֹת Is 35:3, etc.

(b) In the sense of a threat or warning, e. g. שְׂמַח בָּחוּר בְּיַלְדוּתֶךָ Ec 11:9 [cf. Rashi and Ibn Ezra ad loc.], שִׂישִׂי וְשִׂמְחִי בַּת־אֱדוֹם La 4:21, בֹּאוּ בֵית אֵל וּפִשְׁעוּ Am 4:4, אִישׁ גִּלּוּלָיו לְכוּ עֲבֹדוּ Ez 20:39. The latter may, however, be taken in the ordinary sense; namely, that of God expressing His resentment of their duplicity [cf. Rashi ad loc.]

(c) In the sense of an ironical challenge or mockery, e. g. עֹלוֹתֵיכֶם סְפוּ עַל זִבְחֵיכֶם Jr 7:21 [see further examples in Ges.-K. § 110a]

§ 80. Cognate Accusative

Since the verb is derived from the noun [cf. above § 43b and note 360], the noun, even when omitted, is implicit in the verb, e. g. שְׁמִירָה is implied in שָׁמַר, אֲמִירָה in אָמַר, etc. However, in some instances the noun actually follows the verb in the same stem [in the form of a cognate accusative], in which case the construction serves to intensify the verbal idea, in the same manner as the doubling of the last syllable in יְרַקְרַק and אֲדַמְדָּם indicates the strengthening of the adjectival idea (cf. above § 24e); e. g. מַזְרִיעַ זֶרַע Gn 1:11, וּמָעֲלָה מַעַל Lv 5:21, מָעַל מַעַל Jos 22:20, יִצְנָפְךָ צְנֵפָה Is 22:18, בּוֹגְדֵי בָגֶד Jr 12:1, וְגָזְלוּ גָּזֵל Ez 22:29 [in our text גָּזֵל], קָצַף . . . קֶצֶף Zc 1:2, etc.[639] Any case of duplication, whether of verbs or nouns, connotes emphasis and intensity of emotion; for repetition of words is characteristic of persons in a state of excitement, e. g. אֱמֹר . . . וְאָמַרְתָּ Lv 21:1, מֵעַי מֵעַי Jr 4:19, etc.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

§ 81. Transitive, Intransitive, and Passive Verbs[640]

a. The Ḳal is either transitive or intransitive in meaning. Intransitive verbs have no passive forms, e. g. עָמַד but never עָמוּד, הָלַךְ never הָלוּךְ, יָשַׁב never יָשׁוּב, etc.

b. Rem. 1. The following instances may be regarded as adjectives of the type פָּעוּל rather than passive participles: הַשְּׁכוּנֵי Ju 8:11, בָּטוּחַ Is 26:3, בְּרוּךְ ה' Gn 24:31, עָצוּם Ex 1:9.[641]

c. Rem. 2. In some intransitive verbs the active participles are also missing and are replaced by the adjectives of the respective stems, e. g. קָרוֹב [but קָרֵב?], רָחוֹק, קָטָן, גִּבּוֹר, חָזָק, חָכָם, רָשָׁע, סָכָל, צַדִּיק.

d. Rem. 3. There are no adjectives or participles extant in the Bible of the verb יכל. In the Mishna, however, the forms יָכוֹל, יְכוֹלָה, יְכֹלִים, יְכֹלוֹת occur. Similarly we find there פָּעוּל forms with active meaning, e. g. רָכוּב עַל החמור [j. Ḥag. II, 77a] היה תָּפוּשׂ [Shab 22b] for the biblical רֹכֵב and תֹּפֵשׂ.[642]

e. In the Pi'el and the Hif'il, the transitive verbs assume a causative meaning, the intransitive verbs — a transitive meaning, e. g. הֶאֱכִיל, [יִלֵּד], הֶעֱמִיד Lv 27:11, הִלְּכוּ Jb 24:10, etc.

f. Rem. 1. It is perfectly legitimate to use an intransitive verb in the transitive sense in cases where no other form of the stem occurs to denote the transitive idea. Hence, the transitive use of הֵקִיץ in the liturgical formula הַמֵּקִיץ נִרְדָּמִים and in the Piyyut by an eminent linguist הֱקִיצוּנִי רַעְיוֹנַי[643] is correct in spite of the objections raised

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

by some grammarians, including my father [*Zik*. 57 f.]. The analogy which הֵקִיץ and הֵעִיר hold, according to my father, to שָׁתָה and הִשְׁקָה is not consistent, for the latter are in different conjugations, while the former are both in the Hif'il. In the same conjugation, however, verbs may be both transitive and intransitive in meaning, e. g. הַצּוֹמֵחַ Ex 10:5 (intr.), צוֹמֵחַ Ec 2:6 (tr.); הָלְמוּ Ju 5:22 (intr.), הֲלָמוּנִי Pr 23:35 (tr); הִלַּכְתִּי Jb 30:28 (intr.), הִלְּכוּ ibid 24:10 (tr.); יַצְמִיחַ 2S 23:5 (intr.), וְהִצְמִיחָהּ Is 55:10 (tr.), etc. But when a verb in the Ḳal is intransitive, the Pi'el or the Hif'il of this verb and not the same conjugation should be used to denote the idea of the transitive.

§ 82. Incongruence of Person, Gender and Number

a. The persons (first, second and third) sometimes interchange in the same context, e. g. . . . יִכְבֹּשׁ עֲוֹנֹתֵינוּ וְתַשְׁלִיךְ כָּל חַטֹּאתָם Mi 7:19, הֱיֵה זְרֹעָם . . . אַף יְשׁוּעָתֵנוּ Is 33:2, כִּי יֵבֹשׁוּ . . . אֲשֶׁר חֲמַדְתֶּם ibid 1:29,[644] לְכֻלָּם וּלְסַרְנֵיכֶם 1S 6:4, וּבְאֵשֶׁת נְעוּרֶיךָ אַל יִבְגֹּד Mal 2:15, וְאִם לֹא יִגְאַל הַגִּידָה לִּי Ru 4:4, etc.[645]

b. The subject and the predicate do not always agree in gender,[646] e. g. הַבִּיא שִׁפְחָתְךָ 1S 25:27, כִּי יִהְיֶה נַעֲרָה Dt 22:23,[a] אָמְרָה קֹהֶלֶת Ec 7:27, עֲמַל הַכְּסִילִים תְּיַגְּעֶנּוּ ibid 10:15, כל הַנָּשִׁים יִתְּנוּ Es 1:20, יֵצְאוּ בְנוֹתֵי Ju 21:21, וַתִּקְרְבוּ Ez 37:7, עֲשִׂיתֶם Ru 1:8, עֲשִׂיתֶן Ez 33:26, etc. In some of these cases, however, a masculine or feminine subject, as the case may be, is implied,[647] e. g. in אֲשֶׁר הַבִּיא שִׁפְחָתְךָ

a. This is particularly common in the verb היה, because of its being employed frequently in the impersonal sense [cf. Ibn Ezra, commentary to Gn 1:14].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the subject implied is נַעַר (which thy maid's servant hath brought); in אָמְרָה קֹהֶלֶת the feminine refers to the inteligence or the soul which collects wisdom (נפש המשכלת);[648] in תְּיַגְּעֶנּוּ the word יְגִיעָה (toil) is implied;[649] in וַתְּכַל דָּוִד 2S 13:39 the subject is either נֶפֶשׁ or אֵשֶׁת, in the latter case וַתְּכַל being transitive with דָּוִד as the object.[650] On these elliptical expressions see below § 89.

c. The third person plural is sometimes employed to designate one of a group, e. g. וְנָגְפוּ Ex 21:22, יִפֹּלוּ Ec 4:10, etc. Similarly וְאֶתְהֶן Lv 20:14 refers to one (the one illicitly married) [so Rashi and Ibn Ezra ad loc.], בִּשְׁתַּיִם 1S 18:21 means "one of the two things," בְּעָרֵי Ju 12:7 in the sense of "one of the two cities", בֶּן־אֲתֹנוֹת Zc 9:9, for בֶּן אַחַת הָאֲתֹנוֹת etc. [Cf. Rashi to all these passages and Ges.-K. § 124o].

d. A verbal predicate in the singular may refer to a subject in the plural, and vice versa, e. g. וַיָּבֹא משה ואהרן Ex 10:3, וְקִבֵּל הַיְּהוּדִים Es 9:23, לֹא תִמְעַד אֲשֻׁרָיו Ps 37:31, וְעֵינָיו קָמָה 1S 4:15,[650a] כִּי תִקְרֶאנָה מִלְחָמָה Ex 1:10,... יָדָהּ תִּשְׁלַחְנָה Ju 5:26, תֵּרָמַסְנָה Is 28:3, etc.[651] In וַתִּצְפְּנוֹ Jos 2:4 the singular pronominal suffix refers to the plural of the subject שְׁנֵי הָאֲנָשִׁים (see *Shor.* s. v. צפן).[652]

e. The predicate in the plural is used, as in many other languages, to denote respect or reverence for the person, who is the subject in the singular (pluralis majestatis or excelentiae),[653] e. g. נְדַבֵּר Jb 18:2, הָבוּ לָכֶם עֵצָה מַה נַּעֲשֶׂה 2S 16:20, נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ Gn 1:26, נֵאמַר Dn 2:36, etc.[a]

a. To the same category belong also the forms וְלֻקַּח בְּעָלָיו, אֲדֹנָי Ex 22:10, בֹעֲלַיִךְ עֹשַׂיִךְ Is 54:5, בּוֹרֵא שָׁמַיִם וְנוֹטֵיהֶם ibid 42:5, אֱלֹהִים קְדֹשִׁים הוּא Jos 24:19, יִשְׂמַח יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּעֹשָׂיו Ps 149:2, אַיֵּה אֱלוֹהַּ עֹשָׂי Jb

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

f. Singular nouns employed as subjects in the collective sense may be construed with the singular in the predicate [*Rik.* 195] e. g. וַתַּעַל הַצְּפַרְדֵּעַ Ex 8:2, וְאִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל נִגַּשׂ 1S 14:24, וַיְהִי לִי שׁוֹר וַחֲמוֹר Gn 32:6.

g. *Rem.* 1. The pronoun in a noun-clause (where both the subject and the predicate are nouns) agrees mostly with the predicate, e. g. בָּתֵּי עָרֵי הַלְוִיִּם הִיא אֲחֻזָּתָם Lv 25:33, כִּי הוּא חֶלְקְךָ Ec 9:9 (the subject being אִשָּׁה), etc.[654]

h. *Rem.* 2. 'When the subject consists of several nouns connected by Waw, the predicate agrees in gender with the first noun when preceding the subject, and with the one closest to it when following it [cf. Koenig, *Syntax*, § 349s.t and Ges.-K. § 146g], e. g. תִּנָּתֶן לִי נַפְשִׁי . . . וְעַמִּי Es 7:3, וַתִּכְתֹּב אֶסְתֵּר . . . וּמָרְדְּכַי ibid 9:29, וַתְּדַבֵּר מִרְיָם וְאַהֲרֹן Nu 12:1, הִנֵּה אַפִּי וַחֲמָתִי נִתֶּכֶת Jr 7:20, גָּרֵי בֵיתִי וְאַמְהֹתַי לְזָר תַּחְשְׁבֻנִי Jb 19:15. In צָרָה וַחֲבָלִים אֲחָזַתָּה Jr 49:24 the Waw of וַחֲבָלִים is used in the sense of עִם (see below § 86i), the feminine of the predicate thus referring to צָרָה.

i. *Rem.* 3. When the subject is composed of a noun in the construct state followed by a genitive, the predicate agrees in gender and in number with the genitive, which immediately precedes it [*Rik.* 187, also Ges.-K. § 146a], e. g. קֶשֶׁת גִּבֹּרִים חַתִּים 1S 2:4, נֶגַע צָרַעַת כִּי תִהְיֶה Lv 13:9, לְשֵׁטֶף מַיִם רַבִּים אֵלָיו לֹא יַגִּיעוּ Ps 32:6, וְצַפַּחַת הַשֶּׁמֶן לֹא חָסֵר 1K 17:16, קוֹל שְׁמוּעָה הִנֵּה בָאָה Jr 10:22.

35:10.[653a] But in בְּסֵפֶל אַדִּירִים Ju 5:24, בְּסֵפֶל is probably in the construct state, while in פַּר בֶּן בָּקָר תְּמִימִים Ez 46:6 the adjective תְּמִימִים refers both to פַּר and to בֶּן בָּקָר [cf. *Rik.* 157], in consonance with the rabbinic interpretation [Men. 45a].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

§ 83. The Function of the Pronominal Suffixes

a. The pronominal suffixes usually indicate the accusative relationship of the pronoun with the transitive verb, e. g. יְלִדְתִּיהוּ Nu 11:12, לְקָחַנִי Gn 24:7, etc. The noun implied in the pronominal suffixes is sometimes expressed and follows the verb [in an appositional meaning], e. g. יְבִיאֻהָ Ex 2:6, וַתִּרְאֵהוּ אֶת הַיֶּלֶד Pr 5:22, יִלְכְּדֻנוֹ אֶת הָרָשָׁע תִּשְׁרְפֻנוּ אֶת תְּרוּמַת ה' ibid 35:5, הִזְהַרְתּוֹ צַדִּיק Ez 3:20, אֶת וַיַּכּוֹ הָאֶחָד אֶת Ps 83:12, שִׁיתֵמוֹ נְדִיבֵמוֹ Lv 13:57, אֲשֶׁר בּוֹ הַנֶּגַע הָאֶחָד 2S 14:6, וַיְשַׁנּוֹ אֶת טַעְמוֹ 1S 21:14,[655] etc.[a]

b. The pronominal suffixes serve to designate also other syntactical relationships of the pronoun with the verb,[657] e. g. עֲשִׂיתִנִי Ez 29:3 (for עָשִׂיתִי לִי),[658] נְתַתָּנִי Jos 15:19 (for נָתַתָּ לִי), וְנַגִּידֶנּוּ Jr 20:10 (for וְנַגִּיד עָלָיו), חֲזַקְתַּנִי ibid 20:7 (for חָזַקְתָּ מִמֶּנִּי), יְצָאֻנִי ibid 10:20 (for יָצְאוּ מִמֶּנִּי), יְשֻׂשׂוּם Is 35:1 (for יָשׂוּשׂוּ בָם),[659] קְדַשְׁתִּיךָ ibid 65:5 (for קָדַשְׁתִּי מִמְּךָ), יְגֻרְךָ Ps 5:5 (for יָגוּר עִמְּךָ), חוֹנֶךָ ibid 53:6 (for חוֹנֶה עָלֶיךָ), יְכָלְתִּיו ibid 13:5 (for יָכֹלְתִּי מִמֶּנּוּ), תִּמְלָאֵמוֹ Ex 15:9 (for תִּמְלָא מֵהֶם), וַהֲשִׁבֵנִי Gn 37:14 (for וְהָשֵׁב לִי), דַּבְּרוֹ ibid 37:4 (for דַּבֵּר לוֹ), etc. This usage is, however, to be avoided where the sense might be ambiguous.

c. Rem. The noun sometimes occurs where a pronominal suffix would be expected,[660] e. g. נְשֵׁי לֶמֶךְ Gn 4:23 (for נָשַׁי), עֲלֵה אֶל ה' Ex 24:1 (for עֲלֵה אֵלַי), וְאֶת שְׁמוּאֵל 1S 12:11 (for וְאוֹתִי), וְלָאָדָם Gn 2:20 [in our text וּלְאָדָם] (for וְלוֹ), לְמַעַן ה' Dn 9:17 (for לְמַעַנְךָ).

a. Similarly in case of nouns or particles with pronominal suffixes, also of detached pronouns,[656] e. g. וְאַחֲרִיתָהּ שִׂמְחָה תוּגָה Pr 14:13, נַפְשׁוֹ עָצֵל ibid 13:4, יֶשְׁנוֹ עַם אֶחָד Es 3:8, אָנֹכִי נֹתֵן לָהֶם לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל Jos 1:2, וַיַּעֲשׂוּ גַם הֵם חַרְטֻמֵּי מִצְרַיִם Ex 7:11.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

§ 84. Peculiarities of the Construct State

a. A Nomen Rectum (in the genitive) may also serve at the same time as Nomen Regens (in the construct state) to a genitive depending on it, e. g. חַכְמֵי יֹעֲצֵי פַרְעֹה Is 19:11, נַהֲרֵי נַחֲלֵי דְבַשׁ Jb 20:17, מִסְפַּר מִפְקַד הָעָם 2S 24:9, וּמִבְצַר מִשְׂגַּב חוֹמֹתֶיךָ Is 25:12, etc.[661]

b. The Nomen Regens may sometimes be connected with the genitive depending on it by means of a preposition or relative pronoun (אֲשֶׁר, שׁ),[662] e. g. חוֹסֵי בָךְ Ps 5:12, הָרֵי בַגִּלְבֹּעַ 2S 1:21, חֲמַת מִיָּיִן Hos 7:5, גְּמוּלֵי מֵחָלָב עַתִּיקֵי מִשָּׁדָיִם Is 28:9, אֹהֲבֵי לָנוּם ibid 56:10, וּמְשׂוֹשׂ אֶת רצין ibid 8:6, לִנְבִיאֵי מִלִּבָּם Ez 13:2, מְקוֹם שֶׁיִּפּוֹל Ec 11:3, מְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יוֹסֵף אָסוּר שָׁם Gn 40:3, etc.

§ 85. The Function of the Prepositions בכלם

a. 1. The use of the ב.[663]

(a) Usually with reference to the place or time of thing or action (ב׳ הכלי).[664]

b. (b) In a partitive sense, in place of מ, e. g. בַּבָּשָׂר וּבַלֶּחֶם Lv 8:32, בָּעוֹף וּבַבְּהֵמָה Gn 9:10, בְּלַחְמִי . . . בְּיַיִנִי Pr 9:5, בְּרָעוֹת Ps 88:4; also in the other meanings of the מ (remoteness), e. g. בַּשָּׁנָה הַהִיא Ju 10:8 (for מֵהַשָּׁנָה), בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁמִינִי Ez 43:27 (for מֵהַיּוֹם הַשְּׁמִינִי).

c. (c) In place of ל, in the sense of direction, e. g. בַּמִּדְבָּר Lv 16:22, בַּה׳ Ps 33:1, בֵּאלֹהֶיךָ Hos 12:7.

d (d) To express frequency or recurrence, e. g. מִדֵּי חֹדֶשׁ בְּחָדְשׁוֹ וּמִדֵּי שַׁבָּת בְּשַׁבַּתּוֹ Is 66:23, שָׁנָה בְשָׁנָה 1S 1:7.

e. (e) In the sense of בַּעֲבוּר (on account of), e. g. בַּחֲמִשָּׁה Gn 18:28, etc.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

f. (f) In the sense of עִם, ב Instrumentalis (ב' העזר), e. g. בְּשִׁמְךָ . . . בְּךָ Ps 44:6, etc.

g. (g) In place of עַל, e. g. יִנָּתֶן בּוֹ Lv 24:20, רוֹכֵב בָּהּ Ne 2:13.

h. (h) In the meaning of עַד (until, or to degree of), e. g. בְּהַשָּׁמַיִם Ps 36:6, בְּלֹא יוּכְלוּ La 4:14.

i. 2. The Function of the כ [on these and other uses of the כ see *Riḳ.* 29 and Ges.-K. § 118s ff.]

j. (a) Chiefly to introduce comparisons.

(b) To express definiteness, e. g. כַּחֲצוֹת Ex 11:4[a] [*Riḳ.* 29], כַּיּוֹם Gn 25:31.33, כְּהַיּוֹם 1S 9:13, כְּאַלְמָנָה La 1:1. כִּמְעַט Pr 5:14, etc. [This use of the כ was already observed by Dunash, *Tesh. ag. Saadia* 11].

k. (c) To indicate approximation, e. g. כְּאֵיפָה Ru 2:17, כְּבַחֲצִי 1S 14:4,[b] כְּמִשְׁלֹשׁ Gn 38:24, וּכְמוֹ הַשַּׁחַר עָלָה ibid 19:15, כָּאֵלֶּה Lv 10:19, etc.

l. 3. The Function of the ל.

(a) Generally to express direction towards anything.

m. (b) Pleonastically to refer to the object which is either in the accusative or in the nominative,[c] [666] e. g. הָרְגוּ לְאַבְנֵר 2S 3:30, וְהַשְּׁלִישִׁי לְאַבְשָׁלוֹם 1Chr 3:2, אָנוּשׁ לְשִׁבְרֵךְ Jr 30:12, בַּנְתָּה לְרֵעִי Ps 139:2, etc.

n. (c) With suffixes, to introduce the subject in terms of his interest in this particular activity [Dative of Ref-

a. According to the interpretations of the Rabbis, however, [Ber. 3b] this instance belongs to the following category (see below).

b. Ibn Janaḥ [*loc. cit.* 208] inverts the order of the letters כ and ב, reading בְּכַחֲצִי. This is, however, unnecessary, for the כ merely serves to denote the approximation of בַּחֲצִי.[665]

c. To the same class may also belong the use of לְבָנָה Ez 13:18.[666a]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

erence or Interest],[667] e. g. שְׁלַח לְךָ Nu 13:2, לֶךְ־לְךָ Gn 12:1, עִבְרוּ לָכֶם Jos 22:19, סוּר לְךָ 2S 2:22, etc.

o. (d) In place of ב, e. g. לָאָרֶץ Jb 12:13 (cf., however, the talmudic interpretation, j. Ber III, 6a), לְפִצְעִי Gn 4:23, לְכִסֵּא Ps 9:5, לְכָל דְּרָכָיו 1S 18:14, לְבֶן יִשַׁי ibid 20:30, לְמֵי מְרִיבָה Nu 20:24, etc.[668]

p. (e) In the sense of עַל [*Rik.* 19], e. g. לְאַפָּיו 1S 20:41, לְפֶתַח בֵּיתָהּ Pr 9:14, etc.

q. (f) In the idea of בַּעֲבוּר (in reference to, with regard to, or on account of) [ibid. 16 also Ges.-K. § 119u], e. g. אִמְרִי לִי Gn 20:13, לְאִשְׁתּוֹ Gn 26:7, לַעֲבָדִים וְלִשְׁפָחוֹת Es 7:4, צִוָּה לוֹ ibid 3:2, לְבִלְתִּי Dt 17:12, and, in combination with מ or מב,[669] לְמֵרָחוֹק Jb 39:29, לְמַבָּרִאשׁוֹנָה 1Chr 15:13, וּלְמִבֵּית Nu 18:7.

r. (g) In place of the definite article [*Rik.* 20], e. g. לַמֶּלֶךְ 2K 7:2, לַשָּׁמַיִם 2Chr 28:9, לַדָּבָר Ezr 10:14, שִׁיר לַמַּעֲלוֹת Ps 121:1. Some of these instances, however, can be construed in the usual meaning.

s. 4. The Function of the מ.

(a) Besides its ordinary use the מ serves to express the comparative [ibid 26 also Ges.-K. § 133 ab], e. g. מִנָּשִׁים Ju 5:24, מֵעֹלוֹת Hos 6:6, מִזָּהָב Ps 19:11, מֵחֲבֵרֶיךָ ibid 45:8, etc.

t. (b) It is sometimes employed in place of ב [*Rik.* 27], e. g. מִסִּינַי Dt 33:2 [cf. Ibn Ezra ad loc. in the name of Saadia], מֵרֵעָהּ Jr 3:20, מֵהֵיכָלֶךָ Ps 68:30. All these examples might, however, be taken in their ordinary sense.

u. The מ is apparently pleonastic in וּמִלְפָנִים Is 41:26, מִטֶּרֶם Hag 2:15, מִשָּׁם Is 65:20, מִמָּחֳרַת Lv 23:16, מֵאֵין

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Jr 10:6, and in מִלְמַטָּה, מִלְמַעְלָה, מִלְּפָנִים [*Rik.* 26 and Ges.-K. § 119c[2]].

v. *Rem.* The prepositions ל, כ, ב are sometimes respectively duplicated in the same context. Thus, the כ occurs with both objects of comparison in כָּעָם כַּכֹּהֵן וגו' Is 24:2, כָּמוֹךָ כְּפַרְעֹה Gn 44:19, כָּמוֹךָ כְּמוֹהֶם Ju 8:18.[670] It serves in these cases to denote the equal significance of both these objects, without one being subordinate to the other, and is ellyptical for הָעָם כַּכֹּהֵן וְהַכֹּהֵן כָּעָם, etc.[671] Sometimes, however, one כ expresses this idea, e. g. חֵלֶק כְּחֵלֶק Dt 18:8, וְשָׁרִים כְּחֹלְלִים Ps 87:7. Similarly כִּי בְעֶזְרֶךָ Hos 13:9 for כִּי עֶזְרֶךָ or אֲנִי בְעֶזְרֶךָ, and, with one ב, בַּד בְּבַד Ex 30:34 (each one separately, or in its respective weight). The ל is appended to both the object and its appositive in לְעַבְדְּךָ לְיַעֲקֹב Gn 32:19 and לְעָם לְצִיִּים Ps 74:14.

§ 86. The Function of the Waw

a. The Waw usually denotes addition or connection. It also has the following uses:

1. It introduces a word, phrase, or incident[a] [*Rik.* 21–22], e. g. וְאֵלֶּה . . . וְאַיָּה וַעֲנָה Gn 36:24, וּמִמָּחֳרָת וְהַנּוֹתָר Lv 7:16, בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי וַיִּשָּׂא Gn 22:4, וַיְהִי בִּימֵי אֲחַשְׁוֵרוֹשׁ Es 1:1, etc. Ibn Ezra [commentary to Gn 36:24] compares the Waw in this particular usage to the Arabic ڧ.[673]

b. 2. In place of אוֹ *or*, e. g. וּמַכֵּה אָבִיו וְאִמּוֹ Ex 21:15,

a. My father [*Galui* 6] regards the Waw in all these instances as implying a word kindred in meaning to the one to which it is appended, or fitting the context; e. g. in וְשׁוֹמֵמָה 2S 13:20 עֲצוּבָה or דּוֹאֶגֶת is implied, in נִרְדָּם וְרֶכֶב Ps 76:7 אִישׁ is understood, etc.[672]

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

וְהָיָה לַה' וְהַעֲלִיתִיהוּ Ju 11:31 [cf. *Riḳ*. 22 and Koenig, *Syntax*, § 375f].

c. 3. It represents, in combination with a verb or noun, an action in the past having taken place before that represented by the preceding verb [pluperfect],[674] e. g. קָצַפְתָּ וַנֶּחֱטָא Is 64:4, יָמוּת וַיֶּחֱלָשׁ Jb 14:10, וַיִּשָּׂא . . . וַיְבָרְכֵם . . . וַיֵּרֶד Lv 9:22, נִרְדָּם וַיָּעַף Ju 4:21, וַיָּרֻם תּוֹלָעִים וַיִּבְאַשׁ Ex 16:20, וַיָּשֶׂם . . . וַיִּבָּקְעוּ הַמָּיִם ibid 14:21, נִבְקְעוּ . . . וַאֲרֻבֹּת הַשָּׁמַיִם נִפְתָּחוּ Gn 7:11.

d. 4. In place of כַּאֲשֶׁר,[675] e. g. אִם לֹא יִשְׂבְּעוּ וַיָּלִינוּ Ps 59:16, וְשִׂפְתֵי רְנָנוֹת יְהַלֶּל פִּי ibid 63:6, וַתַּעֲשִׂי הָרָעוֹת וַתּוּכָל Jr 3:5.

e. 5. It indicates analogy or comparison [so Ibn Janaḥ, *Riḳ*. 22 and Koenig *Syntax* § 375i], e. g. . . . מַיִם קָרִים וּשְׁמוּעָה טוֹבָה Pr 25:25, דֶּלֶף טוֹרֵד . . . וְאֵשֶׁת מִדְיָנִים ibid 27:15, מַשְׁבִּיחַ שְׁאוֹן . . . וַהֲמוֹן גַּלֵּיהֶם Ps 68:8, אֹזֶן מִלִּין תִּבְחָן וְחֵיךְ אֹכֶל יִטְעַם לוֹ Jb 12:11, etc.

f. 6. After אִם in the apodosis of a conditional sentence, e. g. אִם בְּחֻקֹּתַי . . . וְנָתַתִּי Lv 26:4, אִם כֵּהָה . . . וַחֲיָלִים יְגַבֵּר Ec 10:10, אִם . . . וְיָכָלְתָּ Ex 18:23, וְאִם עָמְדוּ . . . וִישִׁבוּם Jr 23:22 [cf. *Riḳ*. 22 and Koenig *Syntax*, § 415x].

g. 7. In place of ב instrumentalis (ב' העזר),[676] e. g. ה' . . . שְׁלָחַנִי וְרוּחוֹ Is 48:16, וּכְבוֹדוֹ ibid 60:2, ה' וּכְלֵי זַעְמוֹ ibid 13:5.

h. 8. It introduces a question beginning with לֹא, e. g. וְלֹא יֻתַּן נָא 2K 5:17, וְלֹא יֵלֶךְ־נָא אִתָּנוּ אַמְנוֹן 2S 13:26.[677]

i. 9. In the sense of עִם [*Riḳ*. 21], e. g. . . . כִּי הָיָה וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל 1S 14:18, וְיוֹסֵף הָיָה בְמִצְרָיִם Ex 1:5, אָוֶן וַעֲצָרָה Is 1:13 [but Koenig § 375i takes the Waw in this instance in the sense of analogy or comparison; cf. above, e].

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

j. 10. As an adversative conjunction, introducing a contradictory statement [cf. *Riḳ.* 23 and Koenig *Syntax*, § 360bc], e. g. וַעֲבָדֶיךָ Gn 42:10, וָאֲחַלְּצָה Ps 7:5 [in our text וָאֲחַלְּצָה].

§ 87. Interrogative Sentences

a. Interrogative sentences, or statements of surprise are introduced in Hebrew usually by the particle הֲ, e. g. הֲיָדוֹעַ נֵדַע Gn 43:7, הַאִם אֵין עֶזְרָתִי Jb 6:13.[a] This particle, however, is sometimes omitted, e. g. אַף כִּי אָמַר Gn 3:1,[678] אַתָּה זֶה בְּנִי עֵשָׂו Gn 27:24, תַּרְקִיעַ Jb 37:18, and in 1S 14:30, 2S 18:29, 1K 1:24, Jr 6:15, Ps 56:8, etc. [cf. *Riḳ.* 220 and Ges.-K. § 150 a and note 1]. אֶרְדֹּף אַחֲרֵי הַגְּדוּד 1S 30:8,

b. The interrogative particle sometimes serves to corroborate a statement,[679] e. g. הֲנִגְלֹה נִגְלֵיתִי 1S 2:27, הֲמִן הַסֶּלַע הַזֶּה Nu 20:10, הֲרָצַחְתָּ 1K 21:19. My father, however, interprets all these cases as statements of surprise. In my opinion, the function of the interrogative particle in all such instances is to introduce a conversation in general, like the interrogative particles אַיֶּכָּה Gn 3:9, אֵי ibid 4:9, מַה Ex 4:2, 1K 19:9, Ps 114:5.

§ 88. The Function of the Definite Article[680]

a. The function of the article הַ is to define or determine the substantives to which it relates and is prefixed.[b] When this determinate substantive is followed by an adjective [or other parts of speech used adjectivally] this adjective

a. The ה in this instance lends additional strength to the expression of surprise or interrogation which is already indicated by the particle אִם.

b. But in הָאֶחָד Ec 4:12, Gn 19:9, ibid 42:27, 2K 6:5, the article has no determining functions.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

also takes the article, e. g. הָהָר הַטּוֹב Dt 3:25, הָעֶבֶד הָעִבְרִי Gn 39:17, הַנַּעַר הַלָּז Zc 2:8, etc. There are, however, numerous instances in which the article is omitted either in the substantive or in the modifier, e. g. הָעֲגָלָה חֲדָשָׁה 2S 6:3, הַכְּרוּב אֶחָד Ez 10:9, אֶת הַכֶּבֶשׂ אֶחָד Nu 28:4,[681] בַּלַּיְלָה הוּא Gn 30:16, חָצֵר הַחִיצוֹנָה Ez 40:31, יוֹם הַשִּׁשִּׁי Gn 1:31, חֹדֶשׁ הַתְּשִׁיעִי Ezr 10:9, etc. [cf. also Koenig, *Syntax*, § 344s–*a* and Ges.-K. § 126w–z].

b. The article is normally omitted from substantives with suffixes or in the construct state, for they are already sufficiently determined by their prefixes or genitives. There are, however, several exceptions in which the article serves to enhance the determinate state of the substantives, e. g. הָאָהֳלִי Jos 7:21, וְהֶחֶצְיוֹ ibid 8:33, הֶעֶרְכְּךָ Lv 27:23, הֶהָרוֹתֶיהָ 2K 15:16, בֶּעָרֵינוּ Ezr 10:14, כַּגְּבִרְתָּהּ Is 24:2, הַמַּמְלְכוֹת הָאָרֶץ Jr 25:36, הַתּוֹעֲבוֹת הַגּוֹיִם 1K 14:24, הַיְתַד הָאֶרֶג Ju 16:14. Under the influence of the article the absolute forms are often retained even in the construct state, e. g. הָעָם הָאָרֶץ Ez 45:16, הָאָרוֹן הַבְּרִית Jos 3:14, הַיַּיִן הַחֵמָה Jr 25:15, etc.[a] Active participles with accusative suffixes, however, regularly take the definite article, e. g. הַמַּעַלְךָ Ps 81:11, הַמַּכֵּהוּ Is 9:12, וְהַיֹּלְדָהּ Dn 11:6.[683]

c. *Rem.* 1. Proper nouns being intrinsically definite do not admit of the article.[b] Exceptions are הָעַי Jos 7:2, בַּקַּרְקֹר Ju 8:10, בַּשִּׁטִּים Nu 25:1, בַּחֹרְשָׁה 1S 23:15.16.

a. It is also possible that the construct is implied in these instances [e. g. הַבְּרִית (אֲרוֹן) הָאָרוֹן ,הַחֵמָה (יֵין) הַיַּיִן, etc.].[682]

b. הַקֹּהֶלֶת Ec 12:8 is not a proper noun but an attribute referring to the soul of Solomon, which is the gatherer of wisdom [cf. above § 82b and note 648]. Similarly הָאֲרַוְנָה 2S 24:16 is probably also an adjectival noun.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Patronymics and tribal names, however, do take the article, e. g. הַמָּגוֹג Ez 38:2, קִרְיַת הָאַרְבַּע Ne 11:25, לְאַבְרָם הָעִבְרִי Gn 14:13 (referring to his ancestor עֵבֶר), יִפְתָּח הַגִּלְעָדִי Ju 11:1, etc. When the name is composed of two words, the article is appended to the second, e. g. אֲבִי הָעֶזְרִי Ju 6:24, בֵּית הַלַּחְמִי 1S 16:1, etc.

d. *Rem.* 2. The Perfect and the Imperfect do not take the article, except when employed as a relative pronoun (in place of אֲשֶׁר [*Riḳ*. 43], e. g. הַבָּאָה Gn 46:27, הַנִּמְצָאוּ 1Chr 29:8, הַנִּרְאָה 1K 11:9, הֶהָלְכוּא Jos 10:24, הָהוֹשִׁיבוּ Ezr 10:17, הַהִקְדִּישׁ 1Chr 26:28, הַהֻלָּלָה Ez 26:17, בְּהֵכִין 2Chr 1:4, הֵהֵכִין ibid 29:36; so also וְהֶעָלֶיהָ 1S 9:24.[684]

e. *Rem.* 3. The article is also employed to denote a vocative,[685] e. g. הַקָּהָל Nu 15:15, הַדּוֹר Jr 2:31, הַיּוֹשֶׁבֶת Cn 5:13, הַצְּבִי 2S 1:19, הַשָּׁמַיִם Dt 32:1, הָרוּחַ Ez 37:9, הַנַּעַר 1S 17:58, הָאוֹיֵב Ps 9:7, הֶאָמוּר Mi 2:7.

§ 89. Ellipsis and Elision in Hebrew[686]

a. There are numerous elliptical expressions in Hebrew. They are of the following types:

1. The prefixes ב, כ, ל, מ, ו, and ש (for אֲשֶׁר) are occasionally omitted.[687]

b. (a) ב: כָּל מְזִמּוֹתָיו Ps 10:4, בֵּית ה' 2K 16:8, יִרְחֲצוּ מַיִם Ex 30:20, בִּישִׁישִׁים . . . וְאֹרֶךְ יָמִים Jb 12:12, etc.

c. (b) כ: חַטַּאת קֶסֶם 1S 15:23 (for כְּחַטַּאת), נֶזֶם זָהָב Pr 11:22 (for כְּנֶזֶם), אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִךָ Ex 34:18, etc.

d. (c) ל: יְרוּשָׁלַיִם 1K 3:15,[a] הָיוּ בֶן שָׁאוּל 2S 4:2, לֹא

a. A ה is sometimes affixed in place of the ל prefix, e. g. חָרָנָה[688] Gn 28:10 (cf. Gn. Rabba on this phrase), but also לַצָּפוֹנָה 1Chr 26:17 and לִשְׁאוֹלָה Ps 9:18 (cf. ibid.)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

יְטַמָּא בָּעַל Lv 21:4 (for לְבַעַל), לֵרָאוֹת פָּנָי Is 1:12 (for לִפְנֵי), etc.

e. (d) מ; בֵּית לָחֶם 2S 23:14 (for מִבֵּית לָחֶם), אוֹיְבָיו Jos 10:13 (for מֵאוֹיְבָיו), הִשָּׁמְרוּ לָכֶם עֲלוֹת Ex 19:12 (for מֵעֲלוֹת) etc.

f. (e) ו; חָמַק עָבָר Cn 5:6, כָּרַע נָפַל שָׁכָב Ju 5:27, אֶרְדֹּף אַשִּׂיג אֲחַלֵּק Ex 15:9, שֶׁמֶשׁ יָרֵחַ Hab 3:11, etc.[689]

g. (f) ש; הַדֶּרֶךְ יֵלְכוּ בָהּ Ex 18:20, לָעָם עָלֶיהָ Is 42:5, וְכָל־יֶשׁ־לוֹ Gn 39:4, מִן הַשָּׁלָל הֵבִיאוּ 2Chr 15:11, etc. [*Riḳ.* 156 and Ges.-K. § 155d–e].

h. 2. A word of the preceding phrase is sometimes carried over into the next one by implication,[690] e. g. וּתְהִלָּתִי לַפְּסִילִים Is 42:8 (for וְלֹא תְהִלָּתִי), וּזְקֵנִים יָבִינוּ Jb 32:9 (for וְלֹא זְקֵנִים), וִיהִי מְתָיו מִסְפָּר Dt 33:6 (for וְאַל יְהִי), וּגְבוּרָתֵךְ Is 3:25 (for וּמְתֵי גְבוּרָתֵךְ), וְיֵשׁ מֵהֶם נָשִׁים Ezr 10:44 (for נָשְׂאוּ נָשִׁים), כִּסְאֲךָ אֱלֹהִים Ps 45:7 (for כִּסְאֲךָ כִּסֵּא אֱלֹ׳),[691] etc.

i. 3. A noun, adjective, verb, or particle may be entirely lacking but understood,[692] e. g. דַּמֶּשֶׂק אֱלִיעֶזֶר Gn 15:2 (for אִישׁ דַּמֶּשֶׂק), עֲנָתֹת לֵךְ 1K 2:26 (for אִישׁ עֲנָתוֹת) וַאֲנִי תְפִלָּה Ps 109:4 (for אִישׁ תְּפִלָּה), כִּי נֶפֶשׁ הוּא חוֹבֵל Dt 24:6 (for חַיֵּי נֶפֶשׁ), מָה אַתֶּם Ju 18:8 (for מָה אַתֶּם אוֹמְרִים), יָמוּתוּ אֲנָשִׁים 1S 2:33 (for אֲנָשִׁים בַּחוּרִים), בָּא בָאֲנָשִׁים 1S 17:12 (for בָּאֲנָשִׁים זְקֵנִים), שַׁעַר הַפְּנִימִית Ez 8:3 (for שַׁעַר הֶחָצֵר הַפְּנִימִית), אִישׁ־גַּפְנוֹ וְאִישׁ תְּאֵנָתוֹ 2K 18:31 (for פְּרִי גַפְנוֹ וּפְרִי תְּאֵנָתוֹ), etc.

j. 4. The participle or agent is frequently omitted after the verb in such examples as וַיַּגֵּד (הַמַּגִּיד) לְיַעֲקֹב Gn 48:2 אֲשֶׁר יַקְרִיב (הַמַּקְרִיב) Lv 7:11 יַחֲרוֹשׁ (הַחוֹרֵשׁ) Am 6:12, etc.[693]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

k. 5. The conditional particle in the prodosis (אִם) is sometimes omitted and implied [*Riḳ.* 150], e. g. וְתְּמָאֵן Ex 4:23 (for וְאִם תְּמָאֵן), וְנָתַן Is 30:20 (for וְאִם נָתַן), נַחֲלָתְךָ וְנִלְאָה Ps 68:10 (for וְאִם נִלְאָה).[694]

l. 6. A feminine substantive is sometimes implied in a number of instances where a feminine predicate is used impersonally [ibid 153, cf. also Ges.-K. § 144b] e. g. מָרָה תִהְיֶה 2S 2:26, (subst. — אַהֲבַת הַמִּלְחָמָה or אֲכִילַת חֶרֶב), לֹא אַחַת Ju 11:39 (subst.— הֲלִיכַת בְּנוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל), וַתְּהִי חֹק הָיְתָה לְמָשָׁל 2K 6:10(subst. — פַּעַם or אַזְהָרָה),[695] וְלֹא שְׁתָּיִם 1S 10:12 (subst. — הָאֲמִירָה]. Similarly קְטַנָּה אוֹ גְדוֹלָה Nu 22:18, לְיוֹם קְטַנּוֹת Zc 4:10, קָשׁוֹת Gn 42:7.30, etc.[696]

m. Rem. A whole phrase or clause is sometimes omitted and implied, e. g. in נְגִיד חֲסַר תְּבוּנוֹת וְרַב מַעֲשַׁקּוֹת שֹׂנֵא בֶצַע Pr 28:16 the sense is נְגִיד חֲסַר . . . יָמוּת בִּמְהֵרָה, אֲבָל שֹׂנֵא בֶצַע יַאֲרִיךְ יָמִים, so also לֹא תִשְׁחַט עַל חָמֵץ דַּם זִבְחִי Ex 34:25 for לֹא תִשְׁחַט הַזֶּבַח וְלֹא תִזְרוֹק אֶת דָּמוֹ עַל חָמֵץ[697].

§ 90. Syntactical Transposition

a. Transposition of verbs, nouns, particles, or phrases, occur sometimes in sentences where the sense is obvious and does not admit of misinterpretations. Instances of such transpositions are:[698]

b (a) Verbs: בָּאוּ מִצְרַיְמָה לִשְׁבֹּר אֶל יוֹסֵף Gn 41:57[699] for בָּאוּ . . . . אֶל יוֹסֵף לִשְׁבֹּר, אַף אֵשׁ צָרֶיךָ תֹאכְלֵם, Is 26:11 for אַף צָרֶיךָ תֹּאכְלֵם אֵשׁ, כָּל הֵרַע אוֹיֵב Ps 74:3 for כָּל אוֹיֵב הֵרַע, כָּל תִּשָּׂא עָוֹן Hos 14:3 for כָּל עָוֹן תִּשָּׂא, אֶת חֻקֶּיךָ אֶשְׁמֹר . . . אַל תַּעַזְבֵנִי עַד מְאֹד Ps 119:8 for אֶשְׁמֹר עַד מְאֹד אַל תַּעַזְבֵנִי, וַאֲשֶׁר נִתַּן כֶּתֶר מַלְכוּת בְּרֹאשׁוֹ Es 6:8 for וְכֶתֶר

כִּי לֹא הַרְבֵּה יִזְכֹּר אֶת יְמֵי חַיָּיו ,[a] מַלְכוּת אֲשֶׁר נִתַּן בְּרֹאשׁוֹ
Ec 5:19 for הִיא הוּחַדָּה חֶרֶב ,יִזְכֹּר כִּי לֹא הַרְבֵּה יְמֵי חַיָּיו,
Ez 21:16 for הִיא חֶרֶב הוּחַדָּה.

c. (b) Nouns and adjectives: עַל הָרִים יַעַמְדוּ מָיִם Ps 104:6 for עַל מַיִם יַעַמְדוּ הָרִים (on the analogy of לְרוֹקַע הָאָרֶץ עַל הַמָּיִם Ps 136:6),[b] בִּירַקְרַק חָרוּץ ibid 68:14 for בְּחָרוּץ יְרַקְרַק,[c] מְקוֹם שָׁם קֶ בֶ ר Ez 39:11 for מְקוֹם קֶ בֶ ר שָׁם, יַעֲלוּ עַל מִזְבְּחִי לְרָצוֹן Is 60:7 for יַעֲלוּ עַל רָצוֹן מִזְבְּחִי, תְּפַתַּח אֶת־שְׁתֵּי הָאֲבָנִים עַל שְׁמוֹת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל Ex 28:11 for אֶת... שְׁמוֹת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל שְׁתֵּי הָאֲבָנִים,[d] לִי יִזְעָקוּ אֱלֹהַי יְדַעֲנוּךָ Hos 8:2 for לִי יִזְעָקוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל אֱלֹהַי יְדַעֲנוּךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל, הִגְדַּלְתָּ עַל כָּל שִׁמְךָ אִמְרָתֶךָ Ps 138:2 for עַל כָּל אִמְרָתְךָ שְׁמֶךָ ..., שַׂר חֲמִשִּׁים שְׁלִשִׁים וַחֲמִשָּׁיו ,אֲבֶל מֵתִים Ez 24:17 for מֵתִים אֵבֶל 2K 1:13 for שַׂר חֲמִשִּׁים וַחֲמִשָּׁיו שְׁלִשִׁים (this band of fifty being the third), etc.

d. (c) Particles and prefixes: יָדַעְתָּ כִּי אָז תִּוָּלֵד Jb 38:21 for וַתַּשְׁקֵמוֹ בִּדְמָעוֹת שָׁלִישׁ ,הֲיָדַעְתָּ אָז כִּי תִּוָּלֵד Ps 80:6 for שִׁלְּחוּ בָאֵשׁ מִקְדָּשֶׁךָ ,[702]וַתַּשְׁקֵמוֹ דְּמָעוֹת בְּשָׁלִישׁ Ju 1:8 and Ps 74:7 for יֵשׁ לְאֵל יָדִי ,שִׁלְּחוּ אֵשׁ בְּמִקְדָּשֶׁךָ Gn 31:29 for וַתָּשֶׂם בַּפּוּךְ עֵינֶיהָ ,אַל לְיָדִי 2K 9:30 for פּוּךְ בְּעֵינֶיהָ, etc.

e. (d) Particles and clauses: וְקָרְאוּ ... וּמִסְפֵּד אֶל יוֹדְעֵי

a. Some, however, interpret the sentence in accordance with the textual order, taking בְּרֹאשׁוֹ to refer to the horse.

b. But cf. Ibn Ezra in his commentary ad loc.[700]

c. The adjective is regularly preceded by the noun in Hebrew, with the occasional exception of the attributes of God and a few other instances, e. g. כִּי צַדִּיק ה' Ps 11:7, כָּל־רַבִּים עַמִּים ibid 89:51, אֶחָד נֶפֶשׁ Nu 31:28, אֶחָד קָדוֹשׁ Dn 8:13, וּמִשְׁנֶה כֶּסֶף Gn 43:15 and וּמִשְׁנֶה שִׁבָּרוֹן Jr 17:18 (the Segol under the Nun proves its being an adjective and not a noun in the constr.), עַבְטִיט Ḥab 2:6 for טִיט עָב.[701]

d. The preposition עַל may, however, be here in place of ב, like עַל סַל Ex 29:3 for בְּסַל.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

נֶהִי Am 5:16 for וְיוֹדְעֵי נְהִי אֶל מִסְפֵּד, וְנֵר אֱלֹהִים טֶרֶם יִכְבֶּה וּשְׁמוּאֵל שֹׁכֵב בְּהֵיכַל ה' 1S 3:3 for טֶרֶם יִכְבֶּה בְּהֵיכַל ה' (for Samuel did not sleep in the הֵיכַל ה'), חִצֶּיךָ שְׁנוּנִים עַמִּים תַּחְתֶּיךָ יִפְּלוּ בְּלֵב אוֹיְבֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ Ps 45:6 for חִצֶּיךָ שְׁנוּנִים בְּלֵב אוֹיְבֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ, etc.

f. This transposition is sometimes carried over one or more verses, e. g. צָעֲקוּ וַה' שָׁמֵעַ Ps 34:18 refers not to עֹשֵׂי רָע in the preceding verse but to צַדִּיקִים in the verse before that. Similarly וְאַף לַאֲמָתְךָ תַּעֲשֶׂה כֵּן Dt 15:17 is not connected with וְלָקַחְתָּ אֶת הַמַּרְצֵעַ, in the same verse but with הַעֲנֵק תַּעֲנִיק in verse 14; so also in וְהֵקִימוּ אֶת הַמִּשְׁכָּן עַד בּוֹאָם Nu 10:21 the subject of וְהֵקִימוּ is בְּנֵי גֵרְשׁוֹם וּבְנֵי מְרָרִי of verse 17, while that of בּוֹאָם is קְהָתִים in the same verse.[703]

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOTES: CHAPTER SIX

626 Cf. Ibn Ezra, *Moz.* 47ab and commentary to Ex 15:1. In accordance with the plan pursued in the preparation of this text (cf. above, note 82) the modern terminology for the tenses is generally employed, excepting when the fundamental meaning of the original text is vitiated thereby.

627 Cf. Ibn Ezra, op. cit.; also other instances quoted in Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. 126f., note 3. The feeling that the Present is an indeterminate tense is probably at the basis of the talmudic discussion (Ber. 52b) with reference to the form בורא in the talmudic formula בורא מאורי הָאֵש, some construing it as a Past and others as a Future; while all agree that בָּרָא is to be taken as a Past.

628 That there is really no present tense conceivable, except hypothetically, is maintained by Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 3), who compares the Present to a point in geometry, which is a mere hypothesis. Cf. also Ibn Ezra (comment. to Ecc. 3:15) and Nathan'el (*Noviye Materiali*, ed. Kokowzoff, Arabic text, p. 177). Ḳimḥi, under the influence of the Romanic languages, introduced consistently the idea of three tenses, which lead him and the subsequent grammarians into many misunderstandings. "In fact, the use of the Indo-Germanic tense-names for the Semitic tenses, which was adopted by the Syrians under the influence of the Greek grammarians, and after their example by the Arabs, and finally by the Jewish scholars, has involved many misconceptions. The Indo-Germanic names of the three periods of time (past, present, and future) is entirely foreign to the Semitic tense-idea, which regards an occurrence only from the point of view of completed or incomplete action." (Ges.-K. 125[1]). The former is represented by the Perfect, which denotes also action "represented as accomplished, even though it be continued into the present time, or even be actually still future" (ibid.). The latter is expressed by the Imperfect, which may indicate also action in the past of a recurrent or a continuous nature, although more frequently referring to action in the future.

The view that the Perfect and Imperfect in Hebrew essentially indicate character or kind of action rather than time of action, is most clearly and emphatically stated by Driver, *A Treatise of the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*, 1874, and is generally adopted by modern scholars.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

It is however, definitely rejected by Bauer-Leander (Preface V and § 35). The accepted terminology is likewise discarded by them as inadequate, pretentious, and misleading, and is replaced by a new terminology. The authors assume on the basis of plausible evidence that the so-called Imperfect is the only original verbal form having a tense-idea; but they prefer to designate it by the term Aorist, since it corresponds most closely in its functions to the same tense in Greek. In itself this Aorist bears no reference to time, but its temporal value is determined partly by the context or the situation and partly by the modifying adverbs. The "perfect", on the other hand, is essentially not a verbal form at all and has no tense-idea. It is a nominal form and is governed by the principles of nominal flexions; it is consequently termed "Nominal". Thus קָטֹנְתִּי "I am small" Gn 32:11 = קָטֹן+תִּי (for *kū*, see ibid. § 42j), *kabid-ta* "you are heavy" = *kabid*+תָּ (for *'anta*), *ḳatalta* "you are a killer" = *ḳatal* (a killer)+תָּ, etc. Only later, in Western-Semitic, this form began to assume temporal meaning, referring chiefly to action in the past. Consequently, action in the future or present was gradually relegated to the domain of the Imperfect (Aorist). A similar view was promulgated some years previously by Philippi, Sayce, Stade and Wright (cf. *Comp. Gr.* 164ff.). On this assumption the terms Perfect Consecutivum, Imperfect Consecutivum, Indicative, Jussive, and Cohortative, are similarly rejected and replaced respectively by Waw Aorist, Waw Nominal, full Aorist, and affect-Aorist. See, however, Koenig, *ZAW.*, 1934, 151ff. On more specific use of these forms see Ges.-K. § 106ff. and Bauer-Leander § 36. In post-biblical Hebrew, however, as well as in modern Hebrew, the Indo-Germanic tense-idea is prevalent and extensively employed. However, a tendency to express temporal relationships may be seen in such constructions as הָיָה רוֹעֶה Ex 3:11, הָיִיתָ עוֹזֵר Ps 10:14, הָיוּ מְלַקְּטִים Ju 1:7, נָאֱהִי צָם Ne 1:4, יִהְיוּ מִטַּהֲרִים ibid 13:22.

[629] So probably Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 82) with reference to the use of the Imperfect, also Ibn Ezra (Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. 127, note 3).

[630] So Ibn Ezra (commentary ad loc), the reference being to a contemporary condition in the past. Kirchheim in his note to *Riḳma* 187 failed to see the distinction between this interpretation of Ibn Ezra and that of Ibn Janaḥ (ibid.), who construes it merely as a Perfect in the sense of חָלַם. Cf. Efodi's explanation of this interpretation of Ibn Ezra in *Ma'ase Efod* 46, which is quoted by Kirchheim but is apparently misunderstood.

[631] Cf. Ḥayyuj in Kokowzoff's *Noviye Materiali*, Arabic text, p. 29,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

where the same point is clearly brought out. See also Ges.-K. § 110. Early Hebrew grammarians regarded the Imperative as an aspect of the Imperfect. Cf. Saadia, "*Kutub al-Lughah*", Skoss, *JQR.*, N. S., XXXIII, p. 193; also Ben Asher, *Diḳ.* 35.

[632] Ibn Ezra (comment. ad loc.) takes it as an Infinitive for חַת, like מֵרְדָה Gn 46:3. But the moderns suggest emendations (cf. Koeniġ II, 595[1], Ges.-Buhl s. v. חנה and Bauer-Leander 368).

[633] Ḳimḥi apparently has in mind here the theory advanced by Ibn Janaḥ (*Opusc.* 12f., *Riḳ.* 2f. and 83); namely, that the Infinitive is the basis of all the inflected forms of the verb, and that it precedes these forms and is implied in them. This theory was already suggested by Saadia (op. cit.) and was apparently taken over from the Arabic grammarians; see Skoss (ibid. p. 183, note 13). One cannot express, according to Ibn Janaḥ, any of the tenses without presupposing the Infinitive thereof. This is also the opinion of Ibn Chiquitilla (cf. adnot. to Ḥayyuj, N. 21f.) and Ibn Ezra (*Ṣ.* 56b, *Moz.* 48b, and commentary to Ruth 1:1). Samuel ha-Nagid, however, rejected this view as impossible in regard to Hebrew, although it may apply to Arabic; for the Infinitive in Hebrew is, according to him, entirely different in character from that in Arabic, and cannot even be designated by the same term (*masdar* = *source*); cf. Kokowzoff's *Noviye Materiali*, Russian text, 132ff. His reasons are rather pedantic, involved, and unfounded; but more plausible objections to this theory are offered by Luzzatto in his letter to Kirchheim, attached at the beginning of *Riḳma*. Ibn Janaḥ, maintains Luzzatto, was led to this erroneous view by his familiarity with Greek philosophy, according to which the simple (hence the abstract and infinitive) precedes the complex (finite verbs). But this philosophic view is, incidentally, discarded in modern times. The question of the priority of the Infinitive constituted also one of the subjects of dispute between the two outstanding schools of the Arabic grammarians, the Baṣris and the Kufis, the former defending, the latter rejecting it (cf. Kokowzoff, op. cit. 134, note). The Arabic term *masdar*, denoting the Infinitive, as well as the Hebrew term מָקוֹר generally used by the medieval grammarians ever since Ibn Chiquitilla (op. cit.) and Ibn Tibbon (*Riḳ.* op. cit. etc.) clearly postulate the conception of the Infinitive as the "source" of the other forms. Samuel ha-Nagid, who does not accept this theory, does not, however, suggest a new terminology. But Ibn Ezra employs more frequently the term שֵׁם הַפֹּעַל *nomen actionis*, in place of מָקוֹר (cf. Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. 105, note 15), probably at the suggestion of Ibn Chiqutilla (op. cit. והמקור

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

שהוא שם הפעל). This term may have its origin in the medieval view that the noun is the basic form from which the verbal forms evolved (cf. below § 80 and note 639, also above § 43b and note 360). On this assumption the Infinitive, as the basic verbal form, may properly be regarded as "the noun of the verb". This term is also found in Gabirol's grammatical poem *'Anaḳ*, v. 173. Cf. also Efodi (*Ma'ase Efod* 49).

634 So also Ibn Ezra (*Ṣ.* 56b and 67b). The use of the Infinitive absolute in the Imperative sense has its exact analogies in Arabic, where it is quite common, also in the Indo-European languages (cf. Barth § 58 and Koenig, Syntax § 217c). Some grammarians regard such expressions as elliptical, adducing analogies from the European languages (cf. Kokowzoff, *Noviye Materiali*, Russian text, 147[1]). Ibn Ezra (comment. to Dt 1:16) likewise construes such forms as elliptical: שָׁמֹעַ שם הפעל כמו זָכוֹר את יום השבת והוא שָׁמֹעַ שִׁמְעוּ או שִׁמְעוּ שָׁמֹעַ. Similarly we find the Infinitive employed both as a finite verb and as an Infinitive also in Ugaritic (Cf. Gordon, *Ugaritic Grammar*, 57).

635 Further examples of this category are quoted by Ges.-K. § 113w. But טרף is really a passive Ḳal (see above, note 134), while יֵעָרִים is construed by Barth (*ZDMG.*, 43, 180) as Ḳal with *i*-Imperfect (יִקְטֹל).

636 Cf. above § 40e. Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 90) includes in this category also the forms מְבוֹאֵי Ez 36:10 and מְמוֹתֵי ibid 8:8. That the Infinitive can take the plural characteristics is maintained even earlier by David b. Abraham, who construes חַכֵּי Hos 6:9 and רַצֵּי Ps 68:31 as plur. of Infinitive (cf. *Kitāb Jāmi' al-Alfāẓ*, ed. Skoss, I, 543).

637 The moderns generally read here מִי סָפַר, on the basis of the LXX, which is parallel to the beginning of the verse מִי מָנָה.

638 According to Ibn Ezra (see quotations and references in Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. 106, note 22) Infinitives and nouns with prefixed Mem are to be construed as derivatives of the Hif'il conjugation. This opinion is also quoted by Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 90) and regarded as "not remote". But see above, note 304.

639 Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 90) regards these as Infinitives, or as nouns in place of Infinitives. The construction would then be the same as שִׁמְעוּ שָׁמֹעַ Is 6:9 and בְּכוּ בָכֹה Jr 22:10, etc. It would thus correspond exactly to the construction common in Arabic such as *ḍaraban ḍarbān*. Cf. in the conection pseudo-Ibn Yashush (Kokowzoff's *Noviye Materiali*, Russian text, 138f.), who takes such constructions as analogous to *ḍaraba ḍaraba* (Arabic) and נָפְלָה נָפְלָה Is 21:9, סורו סורו ibid 52:11 — a mere repetition of the finite verb, for the sake of emphasis. Ḳimḥi likewise quotes numerous examples in *Mikhlol*, ed. Lyk, p. 61, in which

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the repetition of the same or similar form serves to lend emphasis to the construction. Cf. also Ges.-K. § 117 p–r.

[640] Further discussion and subdivisions of the transitive and intransitive verbs are found in *Riḳma*, chapter 16 and in Kokowzoff's *Ibn Barūn*, pp. 63–6.

[641] Ḥayyuj already seems to have been disturbed by the passive forms of these intransitive verbs, since he finds it necessary to construe בָּטוּחַ as an adjective on the analogy of קָרוֹב, רָחוֹק, קָדוֹשׁ, with Shureḳ in place of Ḥolem (cf. Kokowzoff's *Noviye Materiali*, Arabic text, p. 22). Barth § 31d regards these forms as adjectives derived from verbs with *u*-Perfect, and, metaplastically, also from those with *i*-Perfect. But Koenig II, 136f. construes all adjectives of this type as passive participles; cf. also above, note 108.

[642] So also in the Bible זָכוּר Ps 103:14, which is generally taken in the active sense, viz., *remembering*. Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 189) regards these as passive forms in active meaning, just as the reverse also occurs; namely, active forms in passive meanings, e. g. מַעֲמִיד 2Chr 18:34 for מָעֳמָד, מַכֵּהוּ Is 27:7 for מֻכָּהוּ, etc. Barth § 122c refers all such forms in the active meaning to the *u*-Imperfect; see, however, Koenig, op. cit.

[643] This reference is to a Piyyut of Moshe Ibn Ezra (see Geiger, *Oṣar Neḥmad* I, 100). This use of הֵקִיץ is also attacked by Parḥon 59c. Ḳimḥi displays here his usual progressive and dynamic approach to the study of the development of the Hebrew language, over against the pedantic grammatical views of his father (cf. Geiger, op. cit. 99ff.; also Chomsky, *JQR.*, N. S. XXXV, 3, 290).

[644] Menaḥem 25a reads here תֵּבוֹשׁוּ. The inference drawn by Filipowski (adnot. ad loc.) that this was actually the reading in Menaḥem's text of the Bible is untenable. Menaḥem, like the other medieval grammarians, probably quotes from memory and misreads the passage. The same reading given by Parḥon 3d, which is adduced by Filipowski, may also be a misquotation, for he also reads in the same verse עֲבַדְתֶּם in place of חֲמַדְתֶּם. Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Saadia* 16 and 50), Ḥayyuj (*Noviye Materiali*, ed. Kokowzoff, Arabic text, 12), Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 191), and Ibn Ezra (*Sefath Yether* 35) — all read, with our text, יֵבֹשׁוּ. But Stern (adnot. ad Parḥon, loc. cit.) maintains to have found in a biblical text a marginal note: נ"א תֵּבוֹשׁוּ.

[645] Cf. Ges.-K. § 144p. These and other instances of incongruence are also discussed by Dunash (op. cit.) and by Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit.). See also, above, § 40 1.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

646 Numerous examples of this type are cited by Dunash (op. cit. 53), Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 110f.), and Ibn Ezra (cf. Bacher's *Ibn Esra* etc. 133f.).

647 In like manner Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 150f.) and Ibn Ezra (*Moz.* 5a and 34b, cf. also Bacher's *Ibn Esra* etc. 143, note 5) construe instances of this category.

648 So Rashi, Ibn Ezra ("לשון החכמה שנקהלה בו") and Ginsburg ("personified wisdom"); cf. also Ewald, Hitzig, Heng. and Kue. ad loc., who explain the fem. form of קֹהֶלֶת on the same ground; namely, that it represents the concept "wisdom" in the feminine (חָכְמָה). The majority of modern scholars, however, read here אָמַר הַקֹּהֶלֶת (cf. ibid 12:8); cf. Barton ad loc., also ad 1:1 on the etymology of the term קֹהֶלֶת. But Ginsburg regards this reading as "arbitrary and unnecessary".

649 The moderns read here יְיַגְּעֶנּוּ (cf. Barton ad loc.); but Delitzsch ad loc. prefers to regard it as mere license on the author's part in employing עָמָל in the feminine in this particular instance.

650 The latter is the explanation given by Ibn Ezra ad loc. The former, according to which the subject נֶפֶשׁ is understood here, is the traditional interpretation and is generally accepted by the ancient commentators and grammarians; cf. Targum, Rashi, Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit.), and Ibn Ezra himself in *Moz.* 5a and 34b. But in his commentary to Dt 28:32 Ibn Ezra emphatically rejects this interpretation on the ground that וַתְּכַל is transitive and can therefore not refer to the soul of David as the subject. He consequently assumes that it must refer to the wife of David as the subject, אִשָּׁה being implied in וַתְּכַל. This seems, however, far-fetched. The moderns read here וַתְּכַל רוּחַ in place of וַתְּכַל דָּוִד (cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v. כלה).

650a But we may have in this instance another example of the archaic fem. plural form with the ending ־ָה; cf. above, note 60a.

651 Cf. Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 110 and 226) and Ibn Ezra (Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. 134f. and 129, note 18); also Ges.-K. § 145k and note 2. On the last two instances see Ges.-K. § 47k.

652 Ibn Ezra (*Moz.* 18b) construes this pronominal suffix as referring to each one of the two men, whom she hid in their respective places. But according to Ibn Chiquitilla (quoted by Ibn Ezra, ibid. and *Ṣ.* 71b) this sing. suffix refers to the Infinitive לְקַחַ implied in the preceding verb וַתִּקַּח in the same verse, the sense being "she hid her taking", to which construction numerous analogies may be adduced (cf. Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. 129f., note 18). Ḥayyuj (N. 17), likewise, grapples with this difficult construction and advances two explanations: (1) The

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

singular pronominal suffix may refer to the particle אֵת in אֶת שְׁנֵי הָאֲנָשִׁים as its object, this particle being employed to represent singular, dual, and plural. (2) It may also refer to שְׁנֵי הָאֲנָשִׁים in the sense of "a pair", a collective concept in the singular. The moderns emend it to read וַתִּצְפְּנֵם (cf. Ges.-Buhl s. v.).

[653] This use of the plural form was suggested by Saadia (quoted by Ibn Ezra, comment. to Gn 1:26), as well as by Rashi ad Gn 20:13. Ibn Ezra, however, rejects the possibility of this type of plural, and he explains variously all the passages where this plural occurs (op. cit.). This opinion of Ibn Ezra is shared also by Ges.-K. § 124g, note 2, where these plurals are explained as plurals of "self-deliberation", the use of the plural as a form of respectful address being "quite foreign to Hebrew."

[653a] But in most of these instances the final Yod radical, of the ל״י stem, gave rise to the confusion of the singular with the plural forms; cf. above, note 342.

[654] Cf. Ewald § 319c; but according to Ginsburg הוא Ec 9:9 is a neuter and refers to the enjoyment of life.

[655] Cf. Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* chapter 9 and p. 110), also Ges.-K. § 131m. In the last two examples Ibn Janaḥ suggests the possibility of construing the forms וַיְשַׁנּוֹ and וַיַּכּוֹ as being in place of וַיְשַׁנֶּה and וַיַּכֶּה, the Hē and the Wāw interchanging. His usually sound and keen linguistic intuition may have led Ibn Janaḥ to the true solution, as witness the similar forms in the Mesha' inscription, line 5, ויענו *and he oppressed* and, line 6, אענו *I will oppress*, for וַיְעַנֶּה (or וַיְעַן) and אֲעַנֶּה. This view is accepted by Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Galui* 88) and is also substantiated by the old versions. The emendations suggested by the modern grammarians to read וַיַּכּוּ (Ewald § 252a, note 1, and Boettcher II, 33), or וַיַּךְ Ges.-K. § 60d) and וַיְשַׁן (Bauer-Leander 526) are, therefore, unnecessary. These forms may have preserved the remains of the original ל״ו verbs, which generally changed to ל״י in Hebrew.

[656] See Ges.-K. § 131. The first two examples may be instances with anticipatory suffixes, followed by the noun in apposition, e. g. *and its end, namely, of mirth*; and *his soul, namely, of the sluggard*; cf. above, note 111. Such constructions are common in Aramaic (cf. Margolis, *Babylonian Talmud-Grammar* § 44e), as well as in mishnic Hebrew (cf. מה טיבו של זה Keth. 1:8, מה טיבו של עובר זה ibid. 9, etc.). Cf. also Ung. *Syrische Grammatik* § 21f. Some of the modern grammarians construe such forms as נַפְשׁוֹ עָצֵל as instances of petrified nominative or accusative formations (cf. above, note 111).

[657] This usage is discussed by Menaḥem 71b, Ḥayyuj (N. 118 and

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Kokowzoff's *Noviye Materiali*, Arabic text, p. 47), Ibn Janaḥ (cf. *Opusc.*, Introduction XXXIX and *Riḳ.* 164f.), and Ibn Ezra (cf. Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. 123). Most of the instances given here are similarly treated by these grammarians. Cf. also Ges.-K. § 117x.

658 Olshausen reads here עֲשִׂיתִיו and Smend עֲשִׂיתִים (reading previously יְאֹרָי for יְאֹרִי). The latter reading is suggested also by Pinsker (*Liḳ.* 181, note 2), who explains it on the ground that the ignorant copyists, who were unable to avail themselves of the context in their decisions on the correct reading of doubtful cases, often confused a final Mem with נו or נִי. This resulted in numerous erroneous readings, which can be plausibly explained, according to Pinsker, on this ground. Saadia construes this particular instance as a swaggering statement of a boastful and wicked man, the sense being *I made myself* (cf. Dunash, *Tesh. ag. Saadia* 27). So apparently also Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 114).

659 In יְשָׁשׂוּם Saadia regards the Mem as pleonastic; while Dunash (op. cit. 20) takes it to be in place of Nun, cf. פְּדְיוֹם Nu 3:49 for פִּדְיוֹן. Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 164), however, construes it like Ḳimḥi. The moderns assume the Mem to be due to dittography, because of the following Mem in מִדְבָּר (cf. Ges.-K. § 47n).

660 Ibn Ezra calls attention to this phenomenon in numerous instances, see Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. p. 140, note 20.

661 This point is discussed by the unknown author Nathan'el, a fragment of whose work was edited by Kokowzoff (*Noviye Materiali*, Arabic text, p. 187). This grammarian treats explicitly and elaborately also other phases and uses of the construct state. Cf. also Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 120f.).

662 Cf. above, note 371. Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 133f. and 160) regards these as construct in form but not in sense, the Mem pluralis being omitted in these instances. But this is perhaps merely an extension of the use of the construct state in rapid narrative, cf. Ges.-K. § 130.

663 Nearly all the categories specified here are mentioned by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. pp. 31–5). See also Ges.-K. § 119i–r.

664 Ḳimḥi does not cite any examples of this category, on the assumption that this use of the ב is too common and familiar. Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 31) does mention the following examples: בְּבַיִת אֶחָד יֵאָכֵל Ex 12:46, בְּשִׁבְתְּךָ בְּבֵיתֶךָ Dt 11:19, בְּבֶגֶד צֶמֶר אוֹ בְּבֶגֶד פִּשְׁתִּים Lv 13:47, מוּם בּוֹ ibid 21:21, וְהִכָּה בַכִּיּוֹר אוֹ בַדּוּד אוֹ בַקַּלַּחַת אוֹ בַפָּרוּר 1S 2:14.

665 The sense here is that the preposition has become so closely asoociated in use with the substantive as to be regarded as one word, to which the preposition כ was normally prefixed. Other examples are כְּבָרִאשֹׁנָה . . . כְּבַתְּחִלָּה Is 1:26 and כְּמִפְּנֵי Lv 26:37. Cf. Ges.-K. 118s[2].

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[666] Cf. *Rikma* 13 and 15, also Ges.-K. § 117n ("Another solecism of the later period . . . as sometimes in Ethiopic and very commonly in Aramaic"). Koenig, *Syntax* §§ 271b and 286c ateempts to explain away the cases of nominative with prefixed ל. However, the prefix ל in the accusative constructions is employed normally in Aramaic, and the instances of this construction in Hebrew may be due to the Aramaic influence.

[666a] לְבֵנָה is accordingly to be taken in the sense of שֶׁלָּכֶן; so in commentary ad loc.

[667] On this use of the prefix ל see Ges.-K. § 119s. This use was already sensed by Rashi, cf. commentary to Gn 12:1 (להנאתך ולטובתך) and to Nu 13:2 (לדעתך).

[668] Additional examples of this type are adduced and similarly construed by Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 12f. and 18f.); cf. also Ges.-K. § 119r. The sense of לָאָרֶץ Jb 2:13 is, according to Ibn Janaḥ and Ḳimḥi, ***in the land***, the meaning of the phrase being: "they dwelt or stayed with him in his country." (cf. *Riḳ.*, edition Wilensky, Berlin 1928, p. 48, note 4).

[669] On this peculiar combination see Koenig 330f. Cf. also above, note 665 and below, *u*. But לְמַבָּרִאשׁוֹנָה is probably a contraction of לָמָּה and בָּרִאשׁוֹנָה (cf. Ges.-Buhl s. ראשון).

[670] According to Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Saadia* 11) the first כ in these instances does not indicate comparison but definiteness and is in place of the definite article הַ, as in the case of כַּיּוֹם Gn 25:31ff. (cf. above, j). But Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 29) apparently regards it as an indication of comparison.

[671] So Ibn Ezra in his commentary to Gn 18:25 and 44:18, also in other places quoted by Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. 145, note 11; but see Koenig, Syntax § 371h. Both Ibn Ezra and Ḳimḥi probably follow Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit.).

[672] This is the opinion of Menaḥem, who regards these and similar instances as elliptical, while Dunash construes the Waw in these cases as superfluous (cf. quotations from Menaḥem and Dunash in *Ma'ase Efod* 79). Rashi to Lv 7:10, follows Dunash, while Ibn Janaḥ (loc. cit. 153) and Ibn Ezra (*Ṣ.* 22b) construe some of these instances, in accordance with Menaḥem, as elliptical.

[673] So earlier David ben Abraham (cf. *Kitāb Jāmi' al-Alfāẓ*, ed. Skoss, I, 462f.) and Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 21).

[674] So Ibn Janaḥ (ibid. 22), also Koenig, Syntax § 142c; but see Ges.-K. § 111t. The latter construes them in the sense of the present tense, for which the Imperfect is commonly employed.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

675 This is after Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 23), but see Koenig, Syntax § 366q and Ges.-K. § 159s. According to Ibn Ezra (commentary ad loc.) the particle לֹא before יִשְׂבְּעוּ in the first example is implied also in וַיָּלִינוּ. On this principle he explains numerous other passages in the Bible. Cf. Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. 146, note 15; also below § 89h and note 690.

676 This is after Saadia (cf. Ḳimḥi, commentary on Is 48:16), which is also accepted by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 25).

677 These instances are, however, more plausibly explained by Ibn Janaḥ (ibid.); namely, that the Waw introduces a protasis, the particle אִם being understood and the phrase following being in the apodosis. So also Rashi ad 2S 13:26 and Ges.-K. § 159dd.

678 Ibn Janaḥ (ibid. 220) takes the particle אַף in the sense of the interrogative הֲ. Cf. also Koenig § 371b.

679 Cf. Ibn Janaḥ (ibid. 43), also Ges.-K. § 150e. With reference to הֲנִגְלֹה, however, Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Zik.* 11) distinctly construes it as a statement of corroboration (לְאַמִּתַּת הַדָּבָר) and not of surprise as stated here. Ibn Ezra (*Ṣ.* 18b) is somewhat undecided, yet he is inclined to explain all these instances in the sense of surprise or wonder, except when this ה occurs in combination with לֹא (הֲלֹא), in which case it indicates corroboration.

680 In this treatment of the function of the definite article Ḳimḥi follows, in the main, Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit., chapter 37).

681 According to Ibn Chiquitilla, quoted by Ibn Ezra (*Moz.* 22b), the word כֶּבֶשׂ is implied after הַכֶּבֶשׂ, the intended construction being אֶת הַכֶּבֶשׂ כֶּבֶשׂ אֶחָד.

682 This view is advanced by Ibn Ezra (ibid. 22b). Cf. also Ges.-K. § 127f–i. Koenig § 303b–d attempts to explain away most of these cases.

683 Cf. Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 223f.). This fine and plausible distinction between the definite article in cases of nouns with suffixes and in those of verbal or accusative suffixes with participles apparently escaped the notice of Ibn Janaḥ, since he treats both types as if they belong in the same category.

684 Most of these instances are mentioned already by Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Saadia*, pp. 39 and 43) and are similarly construed.

685 So Dunash (ibid. 39f. and 59), also Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 42). The modern grammarians likewise admit the existence of a vocative in Hebrew, cf. Koenig, Syntax § 290 and Ges.-K. § 126f. Ibn Ezra, however, denies the possibility of such a particle existing in Hebrew (cf. comment. to Nu 15:15). In the case of הָאָמוּר, however, the ה is more

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

likely an interrogative particle, as is indicated by its punctuation and context.

686 On ellipsis in the Bible in general see Ibn Janaḥ's elaborate discussion in *Riḳma*, chapter 25. On the influence of this important discussion on subsequent grammarians and exegetes see Kirchheim's note ad loc. Cf. also Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc., chapter 27. But this observation was made long before Ibn Janaḥ by the Karaite David b. Abraham, who adduces numerous examples from the Bible to illustrate this point (cf. *Kitāb Jāmi' al-Alfāẓ*, ed. Skoss, II, 66ff.).

687 On the omission of the prefixes ב and ל see Menaḥem 70a and Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 159–63). Cf. also Koenig §§ 330 l.m and 319mβ.

688 This ending ָה is regarded by the moderns as a remnant of the original accusative termination (*ă*), which became petrified and lost its original meaning in such forms as לִשְׁאֹלָה, לְמַעְלָה, etc. (cf. Koenig, Syntax § 330 a, i; and Ges.-K. § 90c–e).

689 Ibn Koreish suggests the possibility of the Waw conjunctive being omitted in such examples as כְּכֶבֶשׂ אַלּוּף Jr 11:19. This view was attacked by Menaḥem 25b and was defended by Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Menaḥem* 46bf.) and by Joseph Ḳimḥi (*Galui* 28f.). Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 120 and 159f.) also accepts Ibn Koreish's view and cites numerous examples of this category. This construction (constructio asyndetos) is regarded by the modern grammarians as a rhetorical device employed in poetic style to produce a hurried and impassioned description, cf. Koenig, *Syntax* § 357gh and Ges.-K. § 154, note 1(a). So also in Syriac, cf. Ungnad § 59a.

690 This principle is recognized also by Menaḥem 71b and is operated with, to a considerable degree, by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 155f.) and Ibn Ezra (cf. *Bacher's Ibn Ezra* etc., chapter 27); cf. also Ewald § 351a.

691 So Ibn Ezra and, among the moderns, Baethgen ad loc; also Ewald § 296b and Koenig, Syntax § 277f ("contextgemässer"). Others regard אֱלֹהִים as a later edition, or suggest the reading כֵּאלֹהִים (cf. Ges.-K. § 128d).

692 Cf. the numerous examples of this category cited by Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 150ff.), also by Ibn Ezra (Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc., chapter 27). See also Koenig, Syntax § 306qr on the abstracta pro concretis.

693 In Arabic the agent or the indefinite personal subject is always expressed by a cognate participle of the verb. Examples of this construction are also common in Hebrew, e. g. יִדְרֹךְ הַדֹּרֵךְ Is 16:10, יִרְאֶה הָרֹאֶה ibid 28:4. Numerous other examples are adduced by Driver on 1S 16:4 in corroboration of the assumption by Jewish medieval commentators and grammarians (cf. Ibn Janaḥ, op. cit. 152 and Ibn Ezra,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. 145[6]) that such a participle is always implicit in the verb as its subject. Cf. also Ewald § 294b and Ges.-K. § 144d.

[694] So Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 22 and 151). In the case of נֶחְלַתְךָ וְנִלְאָה Ḳimḥi probably follows Ibn Ezra ad loc. ("אילו היתה נלאה"), for Ibn Janaḥ does not mention it.

[695] That the substantive פַּעַם is implied in these instances is maintained also by Koenig II, 228.

[696] The feminine of adjectives employed substantively corresponds in sense to the Greek and Latin neuter (cf. Ges.-K. § 122q).

[697] According to Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 192) דָּם is a figure of speech (synecdoche) by which כְּשָׂבִים is implied.

[698] Cf. Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Menaḥem* 97), Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 121 and 210–18, where these and numerous other examples of the same category are cited), and Ibn Ezra (Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. 140f., also comm. to Lv 19:24–5). But already Saadia (coment. to Pr 1:19) called attention to transpositions of this type.

[699] Ibn Bal'am (cf. Kokowzoff's *Noviye Materiali* [text] 112) takes אֶל in the sense of מִן, as in וַתַּרְבִּי תַּזְנוּתַיִךְ אֶל אֶרֶץ כְּנַעַן Ez 16:29. Ibn Janaḥ (op. cit. 213f.) also suggests this possibility. This is, however, remote. More plausibly, this instance should be taken with Ibn Janaḥ, Ibn Ezra ad loc. and Ḳimḥi as a case of transposition. So also the moderns.

[700] In this reference Ibn Ezra criticizes severely those who construe this as a case of transposition (cf. Ibn Janaḥ, op. cit. 210). Ibn Ezra's interpretation in accordance with the textual order is preferred by Baer in his note to *Riḳma*, loc. cit.

[701] This is apparently the view of Ibn Janaḥ (ibid. 200 and *Shor.* 351) over against those who derive it from the stem עבט (cf. Targum Jonathan תְּקוּף חוֹבִין). Cf. also Peshita (עננא דטינא), Rashi ad loc. and Samuel b. Ḥofni (died 1034), ed. Israelson, p. 23. Pinsker actually found in a MS. the words עב and טיט separated and connected by Maḳḳef (cf. *Mabo* 110). But Barth § 144β refers this word to the stem עבט and regards it as a *Ḳatlil* formation, like סַגְרִיר, etc.

[702] So also Dunash (*Tesh. ag. Menaḥem* 97) and Ibn Ezra ad loc., probably after the Targum. But some of the moderns construe שָׁלִישׁ as an adverb, the construction וַתַּשְׁקֵמוֹ בִּדְמָעוֹת being analogous to וּשְׁתוּ בְּיַיִן מָסָכְתִּי Pr 9:5; cf. Mendelssohn's translation and commentary ad loc., also Baethgen ad loc.

[703] More instances of this type are mentioned by Ibn Janaḥ (*Riḳ.* 214) and by Ibn Ezra (Bacher's *Ibn Ezra* etc. 140, note 23).

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

p. 10, n. 3, l. 4. Instead of "and may have . . ." to the end of sentence read: and is found already in Saadia's works (cf. Skoss, *JQR.*, N.S. XXXIII, p. 174).

p. 15, l. 2. Instead of [in our text . . .] read: [in some texts . . .]

p. 20d, ll. 7–8. Omit comment in brackets.

p. 20d, l. 15. After מְחַצְצְרִים insert: [in our text מַחְצְצְרִים].

p. 23e, l. 3. Read: קָרְתָהוּ Is 34:11 [in our text קַרְתָהוּ].

p. 25q, l. 5, end. Insert: [cf. Ibn Ezra, *SB*. 19].

p. 26, l. 2. Add: תאסִיפוּן Ex 5:7 and וַיְּאָסֵף Is 18:29.

p. 29, end. Add the following:

i. When the tone is shifted forward, the vowel in an open anti-pretonic syllable in reduced to shewa for euphonic reasons, e. g. נָכוֹן > נְכוֹנָה in the perfect, but נְכוֹנָה in the participle; הֵנִיף > הֲנִיפוֹתִי Jb 31:21, הֵכִין > הֲכִינוֹתִי 1 Chr 29:19 [in our text הֲכִינוֹתִי], תָּהִים > תְּהִימֶנָּה Mi 2:12.

p. 30, n. 6, l. 10, end. Insert: (see commentary to *Sefer Yeṣirah* IV, 3),

p. 32, n. 12, end. Add: Cf. also Chomsky, *The History of the Vowel System in Hebrew*, *JQR.*, N.S., XXXII, 1, pp. 27–49.

p. 33, l. 19, end of sentence. Insert: Cf. also masoretic note to Jr 49:1, regarding יֵשֵׁב, where יֵשֵׁב (from ישב) and יֵשֵׁב (from שוב) are included in the same category.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

p. 35, l. 1, end of sentence. Insert: Cf. also, Ḥayyuj, interpreted by Dalman, *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palestinischen Aramäisch*, p. 61, note; Parḥon, quoted by Pinsker, *Mabo*, p. 17; Judah Halevi, *Kusari* (ed. Ziproni), p. 129; and Luzzatto, *Igroth*, p. 136 f. One may also adduce the fact that the accent never recedes to a vowel followed by so-called Shewa mobile, e. g. וַיֹּאמְרוּ. Evidently the Shewa was regarded as quiescent and the syllable as closed, otherwise the accent would recede under the influence of the Waw Consecutive, as it does regularly when the penult is an open syllable.

p. 36, n. 22, end. Cf. below 47a' and note 412a.

p. 37, end. Add the following note:

[27a] The Medieval grammarians use the term Metheg, Ma'arich, and Ga'ya interchangeably. According to Elijah Levita, however, the term Ga'ya is restricted only to a Metheg attached to a Shewa (טוב טעם, chapter 7).

p. 39, after l. 4. Insert the following note:

[32a] Joseph Ḳimḥi (Zik. 9) was the first to employ this term (דגש קל)) as distinct from Dagesh forte (דגש חזק), probably after Ḥayyuj (n. 9). On the origin of this Dagesh see Chomsky, W., *JQR.*, N.S., XXXII, 1, p. 45, note 63.

p. 40, n. 43, end. Insert: Kahle, like Berliner, sees in this injunction the implication of a single pronunciation for each of these letters, and he adduces evidence from Origen's and Jerome's transcriptions (cf. *The Cairo Geniza*, London, 1947, 102 ff.). But Ḳimḥi's explanation of this injunction is quite plausible. The

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

possibility of assimilating a spirant with a plosive by a process of regressive assimilation is not an unusual phenomenon in language; cf. *The Psychology of Language*, Pillsbury, W. B. and Meader, C. L., D. Appleton & Co., 1928, 231. According to Kahle, the double pronunciation of the בגד כפת letters was "completely unknown to the most authoritative Jewish circles" prior to about the eighth century C. E., when it was introduced by the Masoretes under Syrian influence. The transcriptions seem to point to a spirantized pronunciation for the letters כפת and to a plosive pronunciation for בגד.

p. 42, l. 3, after "e. g." Insert: רָאשׁ Pr 10:4, דָּאג Ne 13:16.

p. 42, n. 50, l. 7, end of sentence. Insert: An analogous phonetic development may be found in the change from the Early Germanic *ai* to the Anglo-Saxon *ā* in such words as *hām* (Modern English *home*) from *haims* (German *heim*); cf. Sapir, Edward, *Selected Writings*, 76, University of California Press, 1949.

p. 45, n. 60a, end. Add: Cf. Noeldeke, *ZDMG.*, 1884, 441. See also below, note 650a.

p. 46, n. 66. Add: An exhaustive study on the accentual shift in the Perfect with Waw Consecutive is presented by Cyrus L. Gordon in *JBL.*, LVII, 3, pp. 319–325.

p. 46, n. 68, end. Add: This Segol is perhaps an intermediate stage on the road from *a* to *i*, a process also to be found in Latin; cf. Sturtevant, *Linguistic Change*, 78.

p. 49, n. a, l. 4. Instead of בַּשְׂאֵת read: בָּשְׂאֵת [in our text בַּשְׂאֵת].

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

p. 51, after n. 69. Insert the following note:

> [69a] According to Brock. *GvG*, p. 299, the form נַחְנוּ is original, while אֲנַחְנוּ is built on the analogical influence of אֲנִי.

p. 55, footnote a, l. 4. Instead of וְיִחֲלוּ read: וִיַחֲלוּ [in our text וְיִחֲלוּ].

p. 60, footnote, l. 1. Omit: [in our text the ר has Ḳameṣ].

p. 60, ll. 2 and 3. Instead of "the last three instances" read: the last instance has.

p. 62, l. 2. Instead of וַתַּעַגְבָה read וַתַּעְגְּבָה.

Ibid., l. 3. Omit: [in our text וַתַּעְגְּבָה]. After תְּרֹנָּה read: [in our text תָּרֹנָּה].

p. 74, n. 82, l. 6, end. Insert: even as far back as Saadia (cf. Skoss, *JQR.*, N.S., XXXIII, p. 178).

p. 75, l. 1, beginning, before דרש. Insert: דקק and

p. 78, n. 100, l. 7, within first parenthesis. Insert: also Rashi to Gn 6:9 and 29:15.

p. 79, n. 104, l. 7, before "Dunash". Insert: Saadia (see Skoss, *JQR.*, N.S., XXXIII, 2 and 3.

p. 80, n. 107, end. Insert: and Sperber, *HUCA.*, XII–XIII, p. 158.

p. 83c, end. Insert: [Cf. *Ṣ*. 19a].

p. 87e, l. 1, after מְקוֹנַנְתְּ. Insert: [in our text מְקֹנַנְתִּי].

p. 88f, l. 5. Instead of "[in our text . . .]" read: [in some texts . . .].

p. 99, n. 127, l. 22. After תְּרַצְּחוּ. Insert: Ps 62:4.

p. 101, n. 137, end. Insert: Arabic grammarians stress two categories of this conjugation: (1) intensification and (2) frequentation [*li-t-taktiri*], that is, expression of plurality (of the action, the actor, or the affected

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

persons or thing). Ibn Ezra (ibid.) covers a larger variety of uses of this form.

Ibid., n. 140, end. Insert: See also Albright, *JQR.*, N.S., XIII, 4, p. 504.

p. 105, n. 159, l. 3 from bottom. In place of הָרָה וְהֹגֶה read: הרוֹ וְהגוֹ.

p. 107, n. 166, end. Add: But הָתְפָּקְדוּ is probably a passive of the *taḳatala* conjugation (cf. הִתְפָּקְדוּ Ju 20:15, 21:9), which is the reflexive of the Ḳal; cf. the Aramaic *hithḳetel* and the Arabic *iḳtatala* (for *taḳatala* by metathesis). In the same category may belong the form ואלתחם (for ואתלחם) in Mesha' inscription.

p. 112b, l. 3, after פְּקֻדָּתוֹ. Insert: [e. g. יְלָדַתּוּ Ru 4:15].

p. 114e, l. 2, in brackets. Read: רֶדְוּפַי in place of רֶדֳוּפַי.

p. 117, l. 5, in brackets. Read: וַיֵּחָלְקֵם in place of וַיֶּחָלְקֵם.

p. 118, after n. 168. Insert the following notes:

[168a] This is, of course, regular, since the Ṣere, as well as the Ḳameṣ, is reduced to Shewa only when remote from the tone.

[168b] But the ending ךָ is very likely the more original; see below, note 384a.

p. 165n, l. 6. Omit note in brackets.

p. 232, after n. 384. Insert the following note:

[384a] This vocalization is rather difficult to explain. In fact, Sievers (*Metrische Studies*, 1901, 289) regards it as impossible for a number of reasons, among which are the following: (a) it introduces an incomprehensible distinction between the masculine and the corresponding fem. suffix (ךְ◌ֵ), and (b) very many forms of this type do not suit the structure of Biblical-Hebrew verse. The proto-Semitic *yadu* with the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

sing. masc. suffix *ika* should have yielded in Hebrew the primitive form *yáḍaḳa* and the classical יָדְךָ, as in Aramaic; cf. the pausal אֹתָךְ, בָּךְ, לָךְ. It would then correspond to the fem. יָדֵךְ from the primitive *yádiki*. Cf. also the plur. form in Biblical-Aramaic יְדֵיךְ from *yadaika* and in Hebrew, in Origen's transliteration *–ax* (e. g. *panax* for פָּנֶיךָ). Pre-masoretic texts discovered by Kahle, as well as Origen's transliterations, actually prove that the suffix in question was vocalized *–ax* and not *–ka*. The suffix *–ukha(h)* may be due, according to Kahle (*The Cairo Geniza*, 1947, p. 100) to Arabic influence and to an urge to restore, as far as possible, the "correct" classical pronunciation. Originally, the ה was needed to indicate the final vowel. After the establishment of the vowel-system, the ה was generally dropped, but was retained in a few rare instances; cf. below, c.

p. 226, n. 358, l. 5. After Joseph Ḳimḥi. Insert: (*Zik.* 4).

p. 251. After l. 4 insert the following note.

409a. This plural form is difficult to explain. The basal sing. form *malk* should yield a plural *malkim*. How did the vowel under the second radical interject itself? Some trace this interjection to the analogical influence of the forms *dabar* — *debarim*. Others see in this form evidence of a broken plural on which the final *–im*, common plural characteristic, was pleonastically super-imposed (cf. Margolis, *Proceedings of American Philological Association*, XXV, 33–4).

p. 274, n. 475a, end. Add: It is interesting that the Yemenite Jews pronounce the word חומש as חֻמש (cf. I. Damati, Kontresim, ed. Yalon, II, 2, p. 63, note 7).

p. 284, n. 500a, l. 1, before ending of sentence. Add: but see *Minḥath Shai* ad loc.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

(The regular numbers refer to sections, the italic numbers to notes)

Absolutes and constructs interchanged, 45 *a*, *b*, *395*, *440*, 58 *b*, 63 *b*, 66 *f'*, 69 *a*, *k*, *591*, *602*, 88 *b*.

Abstract formations ending in וּת־, *572*.

Accent, *see* Tone.

Accusative, with אֶת, 74 *a*, *b*; introduced by לְ, 74 *b*, 85 *m*, *666*; expressed without preposition, 74 *a*; cognate, 80; accusative suffixes employed to express relationships other than objective, 83 *b*.

Active verbs in passive meaning, *642*.

Adjectival termination ִי, 51 *g*, *445*.

Adjective forms, conception of, *258 a*.

Afformatives וּת־ and ִית, 55, *475*.

Apposition, substantive added to an accusative suffix, to a noun with suffixes, or to a pronoun, 83 *a*, *656*.

Aramaic inflections, *220*, *241*, *252–254*, *273*, *306*, *307 a*, 40 *h'*, 46 *k*, *399–400*, *402*, *404*, *419*, *433*, *575*, *656*, *666*.

Article, its punctuation, 12 *a*, *b*, *77–8*; its elision, 12 *c*; anomalous omission of Dagesh in the following letter, 12 *a*; origin of, *75*; its syntax, 88, *680–685*; anomalously with a noun in the construct state, 88 *b*; with perfect and substantive with pronominal suffixes, 88 *b*, *d*, *683–4*; with proper nouns, 88 *c*; as a vocative, 88, *685*; with numerals, 69 *l*.

Ashkenazic and Sephardic pronunciations *14*, *16*, *22*, *412 a*, *432*.

Assimilation, in the case of two identical consonants in succession, 6 *d*, *e*, *40*; of ד in Aramaic, 27 *c*, *165*; of ה in the pronominal suffixes attached to verbs, *172*, *182*; of Waw and Yod in פ״י, 36 *l*; *see also* Consonants.

Assonance, 31 *d*, 36 *m*, *224*, 37 *p*, *258*, *261*, *291*, *295*, *331–2*.

Athei meraḥiḳ, 7 *h*, *51*.

Babylonian system of vocalization, *147*.

Begadkefath letters: pronunciation of, 5, *35–38*; after אהו״י, 7 *d–i*, *k–o*, *50–56*.

Biliteral theory, *81*, *242*, *245*.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Cardinal numbers, 69.
Case endings, remains of, *111*.
Cognate accusative, 80.
Cohortative forms, 20, *97*.
Collective nouns, 44 *c*, *d*, 69 *j*, 82 *f*.
Common gender, 44 *a*, *361*.
Compensation, by lengthening of vowels, 9 *g*; 24 *a*, 34 *k*, *188*; by sharpening of the initial radical in the ע״וי verbs, *253*; by replacing missing radical in ע״ע verbs with נ or א, 38 *a*, *270*.
Conjugations, number of, 15 *a*; arrangement of, *104*; unusual, *120*, *124–5*, *127*, 166 (also Additions and Corrections), *293*.
Consonants, pronunciation and division of, 1, *6–10*; pronunciation of kindred consonants, 1 *d*, *8*; transposition of, 2, *10*, 27 *c*, *162–164*; hard and soft pronunciation of, 5 *b*, *c*, *37–8*, 7 *o*, *56*; hard and soft pronunciations of א and ר, 70, *56*; pronunciation of אהוי״ letters *see* Vowel-Letters; strengthening and assimilation of, 6; interchange of homo-organic consonants, 1 *c*, *7*; interchange of vowel-letters, *see* vowel-letters; interchange of ה and נ, 38 *a*, *448*, 56 *g*; interchange of א, ה, ו, י, and ת, 40 n, t, *318*, 55 *a*, *454*; pronunciation of kindred consonants in succession with Shewa under the first, 6 *d–f*, *43* (*see* Additions and Corrections, p. 374); reduplication of, *see* Reduplication.
Construct state, 45 *a*, *b*; *365–371*; when followed by a preposition or relative pronoun (אשר, ש), 84 b, *662*; before a word with Waw copulative, *395*; before contraction of ־ַי and ־ָה endings in adjectival forms, 51 *g*, *h*, *447–8*.

Dagesh and Rafe, 5; origin of the Dagesh, *32 a* (Additions and Corrections, p. 374), *34*, *52*; Dagesh lene, 4 *f*, *32 a* (Additions and Corrections, ibid.); omitted after vocal Shewa, 5 *a*; omitted after consonantal Waw or Yod, 7 *e*; retained after אהוי״ in the case of successive *begadkefath* letters, 7 *k*, *53*; retained anomalously in other cases, 7 *l–n*, *54–5*; Dagesh forte, 7 *c*; retained anomalously after long vowels, 36 *g*, *214*; omitted in letters with Shewa, especially י, מ, ס, ק, 12 *a*, 34 *m*; euphonic Dagesh, 16 *a*, *52*, *84*.
Deḥiḳ, 7 *g*, 51.
Differentiations in form to indicate changes in meaning, *220*, *253*, 38 *q*, 49 *f*., *434*, 64 *m*.
Dissimilation, of vowels, *14*, 9 *h*, *96*, 37 *i*, *308*, *480*, *522*, *537*, *583*; of consonants, by means of א, ו, or נ, 38 *a*, *270*, *318*, *552*, *583*.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Division: threefold division of the Hebrew language, p. 10, n. 3.
Doubling of consonants, *see* Assimilation.
Dual. 45 *h*, *376*.
Dunash Ibn Tamim, on division of vowels, *12*; of vowel-letters, *45–6*.

Elision and ellipsis, 89, *686*; elision of ה in the Infinitive Hif'il, 25 *j*, 40 *h'*; elision of ה in the Infinitive Nif'al, 23 *e*; elision of the article, 12 *c*, 88 *a*, *681*; of the interrogative particle, 87 *a*; of the particle לא *675*; of the prepositions בכלים, 89 *a–e*, *687*; of the conjunctive ו, 89 *f*, *689*; of the relative pronoun, 89 *g*; omission of words and phrases, *681*, 88 *b*, 89 *h–m*, *691–97*; of objects of comparison, 85 *v*, *671*; of noun implicit in verbal forms, 80, 89 *j*, *693*; of words implicit by transposition from the preceding phrase, *675*, 89 *h*, *690*; of the conditional particle אם, 89 *k*, *694*.
Emphasis, expressed by duplication of letters, 24 *f*, *140*; by suffixed terminations, 37 *t*; by combining Infinitive with finite verb, 78 *b*; by adding to the verb a noun of the same stem in the objective case (cognate accusative), or by repetition of noun or verb, 80, *639*.
Euphonic Dagesh, *see* Dagesh.

Feminine indications in verbs and nouns, singular, 22 *a*, *105*, 45 *a*, *365*.
Feminine endings, singular *ai*, *i*, *a*, *475*; singular ות–, *572*.
Feminine ending, plural, *60 a*, *368*, *650 a*; with inflections, 45 *j*, *378–80 a*.
Feminine and masculine endings in numerals, *596*; interchanged in inflections, 63 *t*.
Formative letters, 43 *a*, *358*.

Ga'ya with Shewa, 4b–d, 19 *a*, 27 *a* (*see* Additions and Corrections, p. 374), 29 *a*; before Shewa and Ḥaṭef-pathaḥ, 18 *d*, 21 *d*, 24 *a*; *see also* Metheg.
Gender indications, 44 *a*, *b*, *361*; incongruence of gender in subject and predicate, 82 *b*, *646–8*.
Gentilic names in ִי–, 51 *h*.

Hafa'al, *293*.
Ḥaṭef Ḳameṣ and Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf, *see* Vowels.
He interrogative, 87; its punctuation, 72 *f–i*, its elision, 87 *a*, *678*; in a corroborative sense, *87 l*, *679*.
He locale *48*, 89 *d*, *688*.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Hebrew Language, as the "oldest" and "chosen" language, p. 7; its subdivisions, p. 10.

Hif'al conjugation, *266*, *298*.

Hif'il and Hof'al, characteristic features, 25 *a*; meaning, 25 *b*, 81 *e*, *f*.

Ḥireḳ, pronunciation of, *see* Vowels; in place of Ṣere, 22 *o*, *109*.

Hithpa'el, meaning of, 27 *a*, distinctive features of, 27 *b*, *161*, in the ע״ו 37 *a*, *241*.

Hofa'al, *166*.

Hof'al, *see* Hif'il and Hof'al.

Ḥolem, *see* Vowels.

Imperative, forms in the Ḳal, 18; with suffixed ָה (cohortative), 18 *b*; shortened and anomalous forms, 18 *d*, 93–4; Nif'al, 23 *c*, *d*, *118*; Pi'el, 24 *a*, 133; Hif'il, 25 *j*; with pronominal suffixes, 32; interchange with the Imperfect, *260*, 77 *c*, *631*; function of, 79.

Imperfect, use of the term, *82*; natural development and use of, 75, *628*; inflexions of the Ḳal, 19, *96*; lengthening of (cohortative), 20, *97*; with suffixed Nun, 19 *b*; vocalization of its preformatives, *96*; reason for Segol in 1st person sing., 22 *m*, *107*; in Nif'al, 23 *j*, *k*; anomalous forms of Hif'il, 25 *k*, 35 *c*, *e*, *195*, *199*; with pronominal suffixes, 33; with *Nun Energicum*, ibid., *f*, *i*, *j*, *182*, *185*, in ל״ה verbs, 40 h, *306 b*; interchange with perfect, 77 *b*; interchange with Imperative, 77 *c*, *631*.

Incongruence of persons, *see* Persons; of subject and predicate, *see* Gender, *also* Number indications.

Inconsistencies in quotations from the Bible, *232*, *294 a*, *387*, *446 a*, *450 a*, 53 *h*, *504*, 583 *a*.

Infinitive, Ḳal forms, 17a, *86–8*; with suffixed ָה, 17 *b*, *89*; with suffixed Nun, 17 *c*, *90*; with interpolated Yod, 17 *d*; absolute and construct, *86*; with suffixed ֶת or prefixed מ, *88*; Nif'al, 23 *c*, *e–g*, *120*; Pi'el, 24 *a*; Hif'il, 25 *j*, *157–8*; Po'el, 26 *a*; with pronominal suffixes, 31, *176–180*; nature and function of, 78, *633–4*, *636*, *638*; in place of finite verbs, 78 *a*, *634*; to strengthen the idea of the verb, 78 *b*; as a substantive and with plur. characteristics, *78 c*, *636*; interchanging with nouns, 78 *d*.

Interchange of consonants, *see* Consonants; of verbs, *see* Verbs; of vowels, *see* Vowels.

Interrogative sentences, 87.

Interrogative words and particles, 13, 72 *f–i*, *609–611*, 87.

Intransitive verbs, *see* Verb.

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ḳal, meaning of, 15 *a*, *b*, *80*
Ḳameṣ, *see* Vowels.
Ḳibbuṣ, *see* Vowels.

Laryngeals אהחע, 1 *a*, *6*.
Letters אהוי, interchange of, 7 *r*, *s*, *59*, *60*.
Light and heavy conjugations, *see* Ḳal.
Litterae compagninis, *111*.

Ma'arikh, *24*, 27 *a* (Additions and Corrections).
Mafsiḳ, as related to אהוי letters before Begadkefath, 7 *f*, *51*.
Maimonides on our Textus Receptus, *56*.
Maḳḳef, 7 *c*, *51*.
Mappiḳ, as related to He, 4 *h*, 7 *b*; as related to אהוי before Begadkefath, 7 *e*, *51*; omitted, 29 *g*.
Masculine nouns, plural formations of, 45 *b–f*, *368–374*; with fem. ending וֹת, *377*.
Masculine and feminine indications in numerals, *596*.
Metathesis, of consonants, 2, *10*, *263*, 37 *v*, *332*, 63 *s*; of vowels, *199–200*, *205*, *252*, 38 *h*, *278*, *281*, 38 *s*, *497*.
Metheg, its function and character, *19*, *24*; with Ḥireḳ before simple Shewa, 3 *f*, 5 *a*; in open vowels remote from the tone, 3 *j*; with Ṣere in closed ultima, 22 *q*.
Mikhlol, reason for name, p. 9.
Mishnic forms, *see* Talmudic forms and etymologies.
Mixed forms, 23 *l*, *m*, *124–26*, 24 *e*, 27 *e*, *f*, *148*, 27 *e*, *f*, *214*, 36 *l*, *q*, *221*, 37 *l*, *t*, *256*, *261*, *293*, *530*, *571*, *598*.

Nasog Aḥor, *see* Tone, recession of.
New coinages, 23 *b*, 24 *k*, 34 *g*, 36 *o*, *233*, 42 *a*, *349 a*, 45 *j*, *380 a*, 53 *j*, *k*, *l*, *469*, *472*, 54 *e*, 66 *j*, *w*, *c'*, *552*, *566*, 81 *f*, *643*.
Nif'al, functions of and relation to other conjugations, 23 *a*, *b*, *114–5*, *24 a*, *134*; forms of, 23 *c*.
Nif'ol, *120*.
Nippa'el, 23 *l*, *125*.
Nithpa'el, 23 *l*, *125*.
Nouns, subdivision of, 43 *a–c*, *359–60*; relation to verb, p. 10, 43 *b*, *360*; collective nouns, 44 *d*; derived from the simple stem, 47; derived from the intensive stem, 48, 53 *a*, *b*, *465*; derived from

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

weak stems, F, *507*; with pronom. suffixes, 46, *382–8*; with anticipatory suffixes, 83 *a*, *656*.
Number indications, 44 *c–d*; incongruence in subject and predicate, 82 *d*, *651–2*.
Numerals, 69, 70; syntax of, 69 *k*; with definite article, 69 *l*; gender indications, *596*.
Nun energicum, 30 *a*, 33 *d*, *181*, 33 *f*, *i*, *182*, *185*, 72 *d*.
Nun paragogicum, 22 *i*, *106*.

Object in the accusative, 74 *a*, *b*; denoted by pronominal suffixes, 83 *a*; introduced by ל, 74 *b*, 85 *m*, *666*; absolute or internal (cognate accusative), 80.
Object of the verb anticipated by pronominal suffixes, 83 *a*, *656*.
Ordinal numbers, 70.

Palestinian pronunciation of שְׁתַּיִם, 5 *a*, *36*, *594*.
Paradigms, history and arragement of, *104*; with pronominal suffixes, 30.
Participle, forms of, in Ḳal, 22 *o–y*, *108–13*; Nif'al, 23 *g–j*, *120–3*; Pi'el and Pu'al, 24 *a*, *d–i*, *136*, *138*, *142–3*; with apheresis of מ, *135*, 37 *v*, *264*; Hif'il and Hof'al, 25 *g–i*, 152–4; Po'el, 26; anomalous forms in Hif'il and Hof'al, 25 *h*, *i*, *153–4*; in ל״ה verbs, *306 b*; nature and function of, *258 a*, *627–8*.
Particles, Hebrew terms, *3*; nature and function of, chapter V.
Partitive sense of בְּ, 85 *b*.
Paseḳ, 4 *e*, 7 *f*.
Passive, of Ḳal, 24 *k*, *146*; passive character of Nif'al, 23 *a*, *114–5*; passive participles in active meaning, 81 *b*, *d*, *641–2*; passive verbs construed with אֶת, 74 *b*, *613*.
Pathaḥ, Pathaḥ gadol, 3 *a*; furtive, 7 *q*, 22 *o*, *w*; pausal, 16 *b*, *h*, *83*, 22 *k*, *36 e*; pronunciation of, see Vowels; reason for pathaḥ in perfect of ע״וי verbs, *242*; in place of Ḥaṭef Pathaḥ in Hif'il perfect of ע״וי and ע״ע 37 *l*.
Patronymics, 51 *h*.
Pausal forms, 8 *f*, 22 *a*, *i*, 23 *k*, 35 *d*.
Perfect, forms and inflections of Ḳal, 16; 3rd fem. sing. in ת ַ, 22 *a*, *125*, 3rd person plur. in וּן, 22 *i*, *106*; 3rd plur. fem. in ה ָ, *60 a*, *650 a*; in the ל״ה verbs 3rd per. sing. *301 a*; interchange with the Imperfect and participle, 77 *a*, *b*; its function and character, *628*.
Person, abrupt changes of, 40 *l*, *339*, 82 *a*, *644–5*.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Pi'el and Pu'al, characteristic features of, 24 *a*; meaning of, 24 *b*, *137*, 81 *e*, *f*; vocalization of, 24 *c*, *d*, *g*.

Plural terminations, 45 *b*, *368–71*; unusual endings, 45 c–f, *372–4*; plural of קִטְלָה(ק) formations, 53 *j*, *469*; of segolates, *409 a*.

Plural denoting one of a group 82 *c*.

Pluralis excellentiae or majestatis 23 *m*, 45 *g*, *375*, 82 *e*, *653*.

Plurality expressed by reduplication, *561*, *589*.

Po'el, form and meaning of, 26 *a*, *159*; in עו"י and ע"ע verbs, 37 *a*, *v*, *240*, 38 *u*.

Predicate, disagreeing with the subject, 82 *b–d*, *646–52*; agreeing with adjacent subject in the case of a compound subject, 82 *h*, *i*.

Prepositions, inflexions of, *382*, 74 *d*.

Present tense, 77 *b*. *627–8*

Pronominal suffixes, with the verb, 28–33; suffixes, 29; with the Perfect, 30, *170–5*; with the Imperfect, 33, *182–6*; with the Infinitive, 31, *176–80*; with the Imperative, 32, *181*; function of, 28 *a*, *168*, 83, *655–9*; indicating syntactical relationships with verb, other than accusative, 83 *b*, *658–9*; replaced by noun, 83 *c*, *660*.

Pronouns, 10–14; personal, 10, *69–71*; demonstrative, 11, *72–4*; interrogative, 13; relative, 14, *72*; agreement of pronoun with nominal predicate, 82 *g*, *654*.

Pronunciation, of consonants, *see* Consonants; of vowels, *see* Vowels; of Hebrew, *see* Ashkenazic and Sephardic pronunciation.

Pu'al, *see* Pi'el.

Quadriliteral, verbs, 42, *346*; nouns, 67, *588*.

Radical letters, *358*.

Rafe, 5, 6 *c*, *f*, *43*, 7 *d*, *i–l*, *o–p*, *51–8*, 12 *a*, *76*.

Reduplication, of letters, 24 *f*, *561*, *589*, 80 *a*; of words, 80 *a*.

Reflexive use, of the ל (dative of reference or interest), 85 *n*, *667*; of Nif'al, 23 *a*, *114*, 24 *a*; of Hithpa'el, 27 *a*; of pronom. suffixes, 28 *a*, *168*, 83 *b*, *658*.

Relation between ל"א and ל"ה verbs, *121*, 39 *a*, *e*, *h–k*, *298*, 40 *t*, *e'*, *323*.

Relative pronoun, *72*, 14, *79*.

Repitition of words, indicating plurality or emphasis, *589*.

Resh, occasionally with Dagesh, *58*.

Segol, *see* Vowels.

Segolate forms of the fem. participle, *160*, *295 a*; of ל"ה verbs in Ḳal

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

40 *h*, *306 b*, of nouns 47 *s–f'*, *392*, *404*, *407–16*, 52 *a*, 54; constructs of קֶטֶל 47 *j*, *397*; pausal forms 47 *s*; construct forms of the type חֲדַר, 47 *b*, *t*, *391*, *411*; mediae Yod, 63 *b*, *513*; of ל"ה stems, 8 *b*, *64*, 66 *e–h*, *l*, *n–p*.

Segolatized forms, *249*, *252*, *392*, 47 *j*, *397*, 53 *c*, *k*, *467*, *469*, 54 *b*, 58 *l*, *505*.

Separating vowel in ע"ו and ע"ע, *271 a*.

Sephardic pronunciation, *see* Ashkenazic and Sephardic pronunciations.

Ṣere, *see* Vowels.

Serviles, *see* Radical letters.

Sharpening of the first radical in ע"וי and ע"ע verbs, 37 *p*, *220*, *253*; of consonants, *see* Consonants.

Shewa, its character and function, 4; its etymology, *25*; its pronunciation before laryngeals, *26*, *27*, 4 *b*; before Yod, 4 *c*, *28*; before all other consonants 4 *d*, *30*; vocal and silent, 3 *c*, *19*, 4 *e–g*, *31–2*, *38*; its omission, 4 *g*; its retention in ךְ, 4 *g*.

"Shewa Medium", *38*.

Shureḳ, *see* vowels; before a consonant with Shewa or before the letters בּמף, 21 *d*, *101*.

Singular in the predicate with collective nouns, 82 *f*.

Spirantization of Begadkefath, *35*; *see also* Begadkefath.

Strengthening (doubling or sharpening) of consonants, *see* Consonants.

Strong and Weak Verbs, *187*.

Syncope and elision, *see* Elision and ellipsis.

Talmudic forms and etymologies, 34 *b*, *g*, 36 *m*, *o*, *253 a*, 38 *v*, 39 h, *296*, *347*, 44 *a–c*, *417*, *424*, 52 *b*, *d*; *454–5*, 53 *j*, *l*, *469–71*, 55 *b*, *k*, *474*; 56 *b*, *j*; *489–90*, 59 *e*, 62 *g*, *510*, 63 *b*, 66 *i*, *e'*, *r'*, *u'*, *556*, *560*, *584*, *587*, 72 *a*, *606*, *627*, 81 *d*, 82 *e*, *656*, 85 *j*, *k*, *o*, 89 *d*.

Tenses, *77*; distinction of, *77 b*; interchange of, *77 b*, *e*; conception of tenses among medieval grammarians, *82*, *628–31*; *see also* Present tense.

Tif'el, 25 *e*, *150*.

Tone, 8, in verbs, 8 *a*, *62*; retracting to avoid concurrence of two tone-syllables, 8 *b*, *63*, 16 *g*; concurrent two tone-syllables retained in participles, 8 *b*, 22 *p*; tone thrown forward before laryngeals, 8 *d*, *243*; shifting of tone under the effect of Waw consecutive and Jussive, 8 *c*, *66*, 16 *h*, 37 *c*, *n*, *243*; its position in ע"וי and ע"ע verbs, 8 *d*, 37 *c*, *d*, *243*, 38 *b*; in the Segolates, 8 *e*, *64*, *67*; in pause, 8 *f*; with pronominal suffixes attached to the verb, 29 *b*; distinguishing

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the perfect from the participle, 37 *k*; indicating direction, *608*; in אָנָּא *612*; double accents, 6 *e*.

Transitive verbs, *see* Verb.

Transposition of consonants and vowels, *see* Metathesis; of verbs, 90 *b*, *698–9*; of nouns and adjectives, 90 *c*, *700–1*; of participles and prefixes, 90 *d*, *702*; carried over one or more verses, 90 *f*, *703*.

Triliteral theory, *see* Biliteral theory.

*Variant readings in the Bible, 3 *a*, *f*, *k*; 5 *c*; 6 *d*; 7 *m*; 11 *c*; 16 *a** (*see* Additions and Corrections, p. 376); 17 *b*; 19 *a*, *c*; 20 *c*; 21 *d*; 24 *f*; 25 *k*; 27 *c*; 31 *e*, *h*; 33 *g*; 35 *e*; 36 *d*, *i*, *k*, *l*, *m*, *n*, *200*, *209*, *232*; 37 *d*, *f*, *o*, *p*, *u*; 38 *o*, *s*, *u*, *v*; 39 *c*, *g*, *i*, *j*, *k*; 40 *c*, *j*, *k*, *p*, *u*, *y*, *g'*, *332*, *336*; 42 *d* (*a*); 45 *a*, *d*; 46 *c*, *e*, *k*; 47 *f*, *i*, *l*, *o*; 48 *b*, 49 *a*, *436*; 51 *a*, *c*, *j*, *446 a*, *450 a*; 54 *c*; 56 *a*, *c*, *e*, *481*; 58 *c*, *l*, *492*; 59 *c*, *500 a*; *501 a*, *504*; 63 *b*, *k*, *p*, *u*; 64 *b*, *t*, *y*, *533*; 65 *c*; 66 *n*, *o*, *r*, *555*, *564*; 69 *d*, *595*, *603*; 72 *b*, *f*, *g*, *610–11*; 74 *e*; 75 *a*, *c*, *d*, *h*, *625*; 76 *a*; 79 *a*; 80 *a*; *644*; 83 *c*; 86 *j*.

Verb, inflection of, 15 *a*, *80*, *104*; ground form of, 15 *b*, *81*; weak verbs, 34–41, cognate verbs: פ״י and ע״י, ע״ע and ע״י, and ל״ה, 36 *k*, *218*; פ״א and פ״י, 36 *p*, *235 a*; nature of ע״י verbs, *251*; פ״ן and ע״ו, *187 a*; ע״ע, ע״י, and פ״ן, *253*; ל״א and ל״ה verbs, *121*, 39 *a*, *h*, *298*, 40 *t*, *e'*; nature and origin of ל״ה verbs, 40 *a*, *301*; transitive and intransitive verbs, 81 *a*, *c*, *e*, *f*, *640–3*; verb with anticipatory suffix, 83 *a*.

Vocalized texts of the Talmud, *225*.

Vocative, *see* Article.

Vowel-letters, 7; function of, 7 *a*, *b*, *44–48*; interchange of, 7 *r–v*, *59–61 a*, 39 *a*, *h*, *k*, *294*, *40 l*, *n*, *e'*, *308–10*, *311*, *323*; when closely adjacent to Begadkefath, 7 *d–i*, *k–n*, *51–5*.

Vowel-signs or points, 3 *a*, *11–19*; subdivision and development of, *11*, *12*, *14*.

Vowels: long, 3 *aA*, *12–16*; etymology of names, *13*; short, 3 *aB*, *17–18*; lengthened, 3 *e*, k, *20*; shortened, 3 *j*, *24*; interchange of: Ḥireḳ and Shureḳ or Ḳibbuṣ, 25 *i*, *16*, *93*, *156*, *177*, *212*, *36 k*, *219*, *234*, *275*; Ḥolem and Shureḳ, 36 *k*, *217*, 37 *i*, p, *255–6*, *258*, 38 *e*, *g*, 40 *g*, *329*, 63 *e*; Ḥireḳ and Ṣere, 37 *p* (*b*), *256–7*; Ḥaṭef Segol and Ṣere, *306*; Ḥolem, Ḳibbuṣ and Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf, 38 *e*, *274*; Pathaḥ

* These variants constitute readings found in the *Mikhlol* which deviate from our traditional text, *Miḳraoth Gedoloth*.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

and Segol, 9 *h*, *68*, 40 *x*, *h*' (*e*), *319*, 63 *t*; Pathaḥ and Ṣere, 16 *b*, *83*, 41 *b*; Ḳameṣ and Ṣere, 41 *e*; Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf and Ḥaṭef Ḳameṣ, 3 *aB*, *18*, *432*, 52 *f*, *458*, *475 a*; pronunciation of: tone-bearing Segol 3 *g* (*b*), *21*; of Pathaḥ, 3 *a*; of furtive pathaḥ, furtive Ḥolem and Shureḳ, and furtive Ṣere and Ḥireḳ, 7 *q*; Ṣere and Segol, *21*, 40 *k*, *u*; of Ḳameṣ (long and short) and pathaḥ, *14*, *27*, 3 *h* (*a*), 47 *a*', *412 a*; Ḳibbuṣ and Shureḳ, *16*, Ḥaṭef Ḳameṣ and Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf, *18*, *432*, *458*; Ḳameṣ and Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf, *22*; Ḳameṣ ḥaṭuf in כָּל without Maḳḳef, *22*, 64 *a*.

Vowel changes, as effected by the position of the tone, or in construct state, 9, 23 *f*, 33 *b*, 37 *g*, *k*, *n*, 38 *f*, 49 *i*, 66 *u*; lengthening of vowels due to the following laryngeal, 9 *g*, *199 a*; change of Pathaḥ to Segol before laryngeal with Ḳameṣ, *14*, 9 *h*, *68*, 27 *b*, 33 *g*, *183*, *232*, 46 *g*, 48 *b*, *c*, *422–3*, *427*, 53 *b*; reduction of the ante-pretonic Ḳameṣ and Ṣere to Shewa, 9 *i* (Additions and Corrections, p. 363), 29 *b*, *168 a* (ibid., p. 377); change of vowel to Ḥireḳ under the influence of the Yod *454*, *471*.

Waw consecutive, 21, *100*; vocalization with the perfect, 21 *b–f*, *102*; with the Imperfect, 21 *h*, *103*; before a tone-syllable, 21 *f*, *102*; before a vowel-less consonant and before בומף, 21 *d*, *101*; before a vowel-less Yod, 21 *e*.

Waw copulative, 21b–f, *101–2*.

Waw of prolongation (vowel-letter), in the Ḳal Imperfect of ע״י, 37 *g*, *245*; in the Nif'al of ע״ו, 37 *h*, *p* (*b*), *247*.

Weak verbs, *see* Verb, *also* Strong and Weak Verbs.

Yehuda ha-Nazir, 70, *22*.

Yaḳtil (Yiḳtil) formations (Imperfect Ḳal) *96*, *187 b*, *c*, *195*, *199 a*, *253*, *275*, *319*, *603*.

Yeḳatel formations (Imperfect Ḳal), *127*.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

INDEX OF HEBREW WORDS AND FORMS*

(The regular numbers refer to the sections, the italic numbers refer to the notes.)

א as a vowel-letter 7 *a*, *44–48*; in place of other vowel-letters 7 *s*, *60*; latent but pronounced 7 *q*, *61*; prosthetic 5 *a*, *36*, 25 *c*, *148*, 27 *c*, after prefixes משה וכלב § 75 *e*, *624*; pleonastic final א, 7 *a*, *47*, 40 *e*, *323*.

אֲאַמְצְכֶם 33 *b*

אָב–אָבִי 46 *e*, *g*, *386*, 66 *s* *565*,

אָבַד 35 *a*, *b*

אֹבֵד 35 *a*, *b*

אֲבֵדָה 56 *g*

אָבְדַן–אַבְדָן 17 *c*, *190*

אָבָה 35 *a*, *b*

אָבוּא 40 *e'*, *323*

אֲבוּס–אֲבוּסֶךָ *306*, 50 *k*, *436–7*

אָבִי (for אָבִיא) 37 *u*

אֲבֵדָה 35 *e*

אֶבְיוֹנָה 56 *g*, *485*

אֲבִילֵי [in our text אֲבֵלֵי] 47 *i*

אֲבֶל־ 47 *i*

אַבְנֵטִים 60 *i*, 67 *g*

אֲגָאַלְתִּי 7 *s*, 25 *c*

אַגְמֵי }
אַגְמֵיהֶם } 47 *o*, *403*

אֲגַפֶּיךָ 27 *c*

אִגְּרוֹת 54 *d*

אָדוֹשׁ 37 *p* (*b*), *254*

אַדִּירִים 45 *b*, *370*

אָדָם (without article) 74 *b*

אָדֹם–אֲדֻמִּים 49 *g*

אֲדֹנָי, אֲדוֹנֵי . . . 82 *e*, *653* (with prepositions משה וכלב) 75 *e*, *624*

אֲדֹנֵי־בֶם 7 *e*

אֲדֹנִים (in the sing.) 45 *g*, 82 *e*, *653*

אֲדַרְכוֹנִים,
אֲדַרְכְּמוֹנִים 60 *n*, *506 a*, 67 *u*

אֹהֵב 35 *a*, *b*

אֱהָב 35 *b*, *f*, *201*

אהבהבו *211*

אֹהֲבֵי (abs.) 45 *b*, *371*

אֹהַבְתִּי 22 *u*, *111*

אֹהֶל 47 *c'*, *413–4*

אָהֳלָה 7 *t*, 46 *e*, *386*, 47 *c'*, *414*

* Words marked with asterisk are talmudic or later forms.

Digitized by Google   Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

אֹהָלִים 47 *c*, *413–4*
אֲהַלְלָה 24 *a*
אוֹרַבְתִּי 22 *u*, *111*
אוֹכִיל 35 *e*, *198*, 50 *j*
אוּלָם (cstr.) 51 *a*, *440*
*אוּמָנִיּוֹת, *אוּמָנִים *454*, *475 a*, 55 *b*
*אוֹת, אוֹתִיּוֹת 471
אוֹפַן–אוֹפַנֵּי *394*, 49 *a*, *b*
אוֹצְרוֹתָם 45 *j*
אוֹרֵהוּ 46 *e*, *386*
אוֹתְהֶם 74 *b*
אוֹתְכָה 74 *b*
אוֹתְכֶם 74 *b*
אוֹתָנָה 74 *b*
אָז (with Impf. in the meaning of past tense) 77 *b*
אֵזוֹב–אֱזוֹבֵי *306*, 50 *k*, *436–8*
אֵזוֹר *306*, 50 *k*, *436*
אָזְלַת 22 *a*, *105*
אֱזֳרֶה 40 *w*
אֶזְרֹעַ *594*
אָח–אַחִים 46 *e*, *g*, *386*, *66 s*, *y'*, *565*, *584*
אָח (one) 69 *b*, *593*
אֶחָד–אֲחָדִים 48 *b*, *423*, 69 *a*
אַחַד (in absol. state), 69 *a*, *591*
אַחְדְּלָה 19 *c*
אָחִיו 66 *k*, *553*
אָחוֹת 66 *y'*, *584*
אַחוֹתֵיךְ 45 *j*, *380*, 66 *y'*, *584*
אֹחַז 35 *a*, *b*
אֲחַשְׁנָה *121*, 39 *i*
אֲחָיוֹתֵךְ 45 *j*, *379*, 66 *y'*, *z'*, 584
אֲחַל 38 *q*
אַחַר, אַחֲרֵי 45 *k*, 48 *c*, *426*
אַחֵר–אַחֶרֶת 47 *k*, *398*
אֶחֱרוּ 24 *a*
אַחֲרֵי 51, *450*
אֲחַרִין 45 *f*
אַחַת *207 a*, 69 *a*, *591–2*
אֶחָת 69 *b*, *592*
אַטּוּן 50 *k*, *436*
אֵי, אַיֵּה (with suffixes) 72 *d*, *607*
אֵילַי (for אֵלַי) 63 *c*
אֵילִים (cstr.) 45 *b*, *370*
אֵילְכָה 36 *a*
אִיִּן 45 *f*
אִין 72, *605*
אַיְסִירֵם 36 *i*
אֵיתָם 38 *d*
אֹכַל 35 *a*, *b*
אֱכָל 24 *k*, *142*, 51 *b*, *442*
אֲכָלְךָ (for אֲכַלְךָ) 40 *x*, *319*
אִבְּרֵיכֶם 48 *b*
אֶל־אֱלֵי 45 *k*, *382*, 74 *d*, *674*
אֱלֹהִים 82 *e*, *653*
אָלוֹת (Inf. abs.) 40 *f*, *305*
אֲלֵיהֵימָה 46 *m*, *388*
אַלְמוֹת 47 *g*
אֲלַקֳטָה 20 *a*, *98*
אָמָה–אֲמָהוֹת 54 b, *474*, 66 *u'* •
*אִמָּהוֹת *474*
אָמָן 51 *b*, 475 *a*

אֹמֶר 35 *a, b*
אֲמָרִים (cstr.) 45 *a*, *367*
אָן–אָנָה *50*
אָנָה 72 *e*, *608*
אָנָּה, אָנָּא 73 *a*, *612*
אֲנוּ (Jr. 42:6) 10 *c*, *70*
אָנוּשׁ (in the active meaning) *108*
אַנְשֵׁי 45 *b*, *371*
אֲסֵפָה (cstr.) 45 *a*, *367*
אָסְפָה 18 *c*
אֹסְפָה (from אסף) 35 *b*, *235 a*
אֹסִפְךָ 35 *e*, *235 a*, *428*
אֲסָרֶיהָ, אֱסָרֶהָ *401*
אֱסָרֵי 47 *n*, *401*
אֶסֳּרֵם 20 *a*, 36 *l*
אֶעֱלֶה (ḳal) 40 *i*
אֶעֱנֶה (ḳal) 40 *i*
אַף 64 *b*, (as interrogative) *678*
אַפְאֵיהֶם 33 *g*, 41 *d*, *342*
אַפַּדְנוֹ 60 *l*, *505*
אֹפֶה 35 *a*, *b*
אֵפוֹ 40 *g*, *306*
אֵפוֹד 50 *k*, *436*
אַף־כִּי 87 *a*, *678*
אַפִּרְיוֹן 60 *m*, *506*
אֶפְשְׁעָה 20 *a*
אֶצָּק־ 36 *l*
אֶקֹּב 38 *d*, *273*
אַרְאֶךָּ 30 *a*, *171*
אֶרֶה־לִּי 38 *f*, *276*
אַרְגִּיעָה 60 *j*, *504*

אָרוֹן (abs.) 49 *d*, *430*
אֲרַיֶּךָ 40 *x*, *320*
אֻרוֹת 53 *l*, *472*
אֲרוֹמָם 37 *v*, 38 *m*, *284–5*
אֶרְפָּה 39 *a*
אַרְמְנוֹת 56 *a*, *469*, 60 *h*
אָרֶץ 47 *s*
אִשׁ = יֵשׁ } (Kethib) *107*
אִשַׁי = יֵשׁ }
אִשָּׁה 43 *b*
אַשְׁכֹּלוֹת, אֶשְׁכְּלוֹת *469*, 60 *h*
אַשְׁמַנִּים 60 *g*, *502*
אַשְׁמָתֵינוּ *380*
אֶשְׁעָה 36 *d*, *210*, 40 *k*
אָשֵׁף [in our text אַשָּׁף] 47 *f*
אַשְׁפֹּת 55 *b*, *476*
אֶשְׁקָה 20 *a*
אֶשְׁקֳטָה 20 *a*
אֲשֶׁר (ש) as a relative pronoun and in combination with לְ, 14, origin of, *79*, elision of, 89 *g*
אַשְׁרֵהוּ 46 *k*, *390*
אַשְׁרֵי 45 *k*, *426*
אִשְׁתִּיו 25 *c*, 40 *h*'
אֶשְׁתּוֹלְלוּ 27 *e*
אֵת, אֶת־ origin, function and vocalization of, 74 *a*, *612 a*; inflexions of, 74 *b*; not denoting accus. 38 *d*, 74 *a*, *613*; omitted in the accus., ibid.
אַתְּ as a masc. pronoun 10 *b*], origin of, *69*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

אֲתָה, אֲתָה, אַתָּה 10 *a*
אֲשֻׁרָה (cstr.) 45 *a*, *367*
אֶתְחַבַּר 7 *s*, 25 *c*, 27 *e*
אַתִּי–אַתְּי *69*
אֲתָיו 40 *g*, *306*
אָתֵי מֵרַחִיק 7 *h*, *51*
אַתִּיק 60 *j*
אַתִּיקֶהָא 46 *l*
אֶתְמוּל–אִתְמוֹל, אֶתְמֹל 60 *h*, *503*, *594*
אַתֵּן–אַתֵּנָה 10 *d*, *71*

ב preposition 75 *b*; to meanings 85 *a–h*, *663–4*; its punctuation 75 *b–f*; with suffixes 76; with interrogative particle מָה 75 *h*; relative to place or time of thing or action 85 *a*, *664*; partitive 85 *b*; denoting direction 85 *c*; expressing frequency or recurrence 85 *d*; indicating cause or reason 85 *e*; ב *instrumenti* with the object 85 *f*; in the sense of *on* 85 *g*; in the meaning of *until*, to the degree of, 85 *h*; elision of, 89 *b*, *687*

בֹּאוּ 37 *s*, *260*
בֵּאלֹהִים 75 *c*, 623
בֹּאֶנָה 31 *j*, 37 *s*
בְּאֱרוֹת 47 *o*, *407*
בְּאשׁ, בָּאשָׁם *404*, 47 *c'*
בְּבִגְדוֹ *177*
בְּבֵן 74 *e*
בִּבְטוֹתֵיךְ 40 *e*, 78*c*, *636*
בִּגְדוֹל 50 *b*, 435 *b*

בֶּגוֹדָה *108*, 49 *f*, *433*
בְּהַדָּרֶךְ *84*
בָּהוּ 51 *f*, *444*
בְּהִזָּרוֹתֵיכֶם 40 *e*, 78*c*, *636*
בְּהַכֵּן 88 *d*, *684*
בֶּהָלָה 48 *b*, *422*
בְּהִלּוֹ 38 *a*, *275*
בְּהַמָּה–בְּהֶמְתְּךָ 53 *c*, *467*, 54 *b*
בָּהֶן 47 *c'*, *d'*
בָּהֵן 76 *a*
בְּהִנָּבְאוֹתוֹ 39 *h*
בְּהֹטוֹת 47 *d'*, *415*
בֶּהָרֵג 23 *e*
בְּהַשַּׁמָּה
בְּהָשַּׁמָּה } 38 *s*, *290*
בּוֹסִים *255*, *258 a*
בּוֹשׁ 37 *b*, *241*
בּוֹשַׁסְכֶם *159*
בָּזְאוּ 38 *a*, *270*
בְּזֹה 66 *j*, *551*
38 *v*
בַּחוּרִים
בְּחוּרִים } 50 *f*
בְּחֵטְאָה 31 *d*, *177*
בְּחָקוֹ 38 *v*
בָּטוּחַ (in active sense) *108*, 81 *b*, *641*
בֵּיאוֹר 12 *a*
בֵּין (cstr.) 47 *i*
בֵּינוּ *251*
בֵּינוֹתִי 37 *l*, *251*
בֵּינוֹתָם–בֵּינוֹתֵנוּ 74 *e*, *616*
בִּיקְרוֹתֶיךָ 7 *c*, *28*, *52*, 75 *d*
בַּיִת 63 *b*, *513*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

בִּיתָן 56 *b*, *482*
בָּכוֹ 40 *f*, *305*
בְּכִיָּה 40 *n*
בְּכְתֻּוֹתָם (in our text בְּכְתֻוֹתָם) 51 *c*, *469*, 54 *e*
בְּכָשְׁלוֹ 23 *e*
בְּכָתֵף (cstr.) 47 *j*
בַּכְּהוֹת 53 *a*, *465*
בְּלוֹיֵ 22 *v*
בִּלְעֲדֵי–בִּלְעָדַי 74 *d*, *615*
בִּלְתִּי 74 e, *617*
בְּמוֹ 75 *b*, *622*
בִּמְלוֹאת 39 *h*
בְּמֹצַאֲכֶם *91*, 31, *180*
בָּמֳתֵי 63 *q*, *527*
בֵּן, בֶּן־ 66 *t*, *u*
בִּן־נוּן 6 *e*, *40*
בָּנוּ 37 *s*
בְּנוֹ (cstr.) 81, *111*
בְּנֵיהֶם 46 *g*, 66 *q*, *558–9*
בְּ נָ תִ י 40 *a*
בַּעֲדֵנִי 46 *b*, *383*
בְּעוֹדֶנּוּ 46 *b*, *383*
בְּעֱזוֹר 75 *c*
בַּעֲסַף 23 *e*
בַּעֲלֵי 75 *c*
בַּעֲלִיל 57 *e*, *489*
בְּעָלִים 45 *g*, 82 *l*, *653*
בֹּעֲרָה 22 *r*
בַּעֲרֵינוּ 88 *b*
בַּעֲשַׂר 25 *j*, *603*
בַּפֵּשׂ 63 *d*, *516*
בִּפְתָחִי 31 *d*, *177*
בַּצָּרָה 53 *a*, *464*
בַּצֹּרֶת–בַּצֹּרוֹת 53 *j*, *469*
בַּקָּרַת־ 53 *a*
בְּקָרִים 47 *a'*, *413*
בְּרָדִים *394*
בָּרוּךְ 81 *b*, *641*
בָּרוּךְ 24 *a*, *130*
בְּרִי *see* רִי
בֹּרִית 55 *g*
בִּרְכוֹהִי 5 *c*, *38*
בִּרְכֵּיהֶם–בִּרְכֵּיהֶם 5 *c*, *38*
בַּשְּׂאֵת 12 *a*
בְּשִׁבְרִי 31 *d*, *177*
בְּשׁוּבֵנִי 31 *f*, *178*
בְּשׁוּרַי 37 *p* (*b*)
בְּשִׁיבָתוֹ 37 *v*
בְּשָׁמִי 47 *a'*, *413*
בָּשְׁנָה 63 *m*, *523*
בָּתִּים 7 *d*, *50*, 63 *b*, *514*
בְּתְשׁוּמֶת־ 63 *t*

גְּאָיוֹת 65 *c*, *547*
גֻּבְהָא 22 *c*
גְּבֹהַּ 50 *b*, *435 b*
גְּבוֹרֶהוּ (in our text גְּבוֹרֵיהוּ) 46 *k*, *390*
גְּבִירָה–גְּבִרְתִּי *469*, 54 *b*
גִּבְּתוֹן 56 *f*
גּוֹבָי (in our text גֹּבַי) 45 *d*
גְּדְלוֹ 47 *z*
גֵּוָה (for גַּאֲוָה) *341*
גּוֹי 37 *p* (*b*) *258 a*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

גּוֹחִי 37 *p* (*b*), *258 a*

גּוֹיִם 45 *e*, *373a*

גְּוִיּוֹתֵיהֶנָּה 46 *m*, *388*

גּוּמָּץ 51 *b*

גָּזִי 38 *f*

גָּזִית 55 *g*, *477*

גְּזֶל (cstr) 47 *j*, *397*

גֶּחָלִים–גַּחֲלֵי 48 *b*, *422*

גַּיְא, גָּיא, גֵּיא, גַּי 47 *e'*, *416*, 63 *b*, 65 *c*, 66 *r*

גֵּילוּ *251*

גִּילוֹתִי 51 *h*, *448*

גִּילַת 395

גַּל (adj.) 38 *i*

גֻּלְגֹּלֶת, גֻּלְגְּלוֹתָם, *גֻּלְגְּלִיּוֹת 469, 471

גְּלָה 59 c, *500 a*

גְּלָיוֹת 66 *r'*, *575*

גְּלָלוֹ 47 *w*

גָּלָה *301*, *301 a*

גָּלְתָה *302*

גְּמַלִּים 47 *e*, *394*

גְּנֻבְתִי 22 *y*, *111*

גַּפּוֹהִי (Aram.) 27 *c*

גֵּרָה 64 *q*

גַּרְזֶן 56 *i*, *486*, 67 *f*

גֶּשׁ־ 34 *e*, *187 c*

גְּשׁוּ, גְּשִׁי } 34 *f*, *217*

גְּשָׁמָה 59 *c*, *500 a*

דָּאג 7 *a*, *48* (see Additions and Corrections, p. 375)

דִּבֵּר 24 *a*, *132*

דְּבַשׁ–דִּבְשִׁי 47 *o*, *404*

דּוֹד–דּוֹדִים 63 *e*, *520*

דּוּמָם 56 *m*, *488*

דּוּמָה 37 *p* (*b*)

*דּוֹר (from נדר) 34 *g*

דְּוֹתָה 66 *p'*, *574*

דְּחִיק 7 *g*, *51*

דְּיוֹ 66 *j*, *552*

דַּלְיוּ 40 *v*, *318*

דְּלֶתְךָ 47 *t*, *411*

דְּלָתַיִם 47 *d*, *393*

דָּם–דִּמְכֶם 66 *r*

דָּמְיָה 40 *n*, *311*, 53 *h*

דָּנִאֵל 7 *q*

דָּנַגִּי 30 *a*, *171*

דֵּעָה 36 *d*, *209*

דָּרְבָן 56 *c*, *484*

דְּרָכַיִם 47 *d*, *393*

דַּרְכֶּךָ 45 *e*

דַּרְכְּמוֹנִים 60 *n*, *506 a*, 67 *e*

דְּרוֹתָם 45 *j*, *379*

דָּתָן–דָּתָיְנָה *376*

ה as a vowel-letter 7 *b*, *48*, as a consonant or quiescent 7 *b*, in place of other vowel-letters, 7 *t*, *60 a*, 42 *f* (*b*)

ה as an interrogative particle 87; its punctuation 72 *f–i*, *609*; its elision, 87 *a*, *678*; as a corroboration of a statement 87 *b*, *679*

ה locale *48*, 89 *d*, *688*

־ָה as an indication of the feminine, 22 *a*, *105* and 45 *a*, *653*

ה as a plural indication (anomalously) *60 a*

־ָה as a cohortative ending, 18 *b*, *c*; 20

ה article 12, *75*; its punctuation 12 *a*, *b*, *76–8*; its elision, 12 *c*, 88 *a*, *b*, *681*; its syntax, 88, *680*, *682–5*. *See also* article in Index of Subjects

הַאִדָּרֹשׁ 23 *f*, *119*

הָאָהֳלִי 88 *b*

הָאוֹתִיּוֹת 40 *n*

הֶאֱזְנִיחוּ 25 *e*

הֶאָכוֹל 23 *f*

הֶאָסוֹף 23 *f*

הָאֲרַוְנָה 88 *c*

הֶאֱרִיךְ 25 *j*, *157*

הַבָּאָה 88 *d*, *684*

הָבָה, הָבָה 36 *d*, 37 *c*, *243*

הָבָה־לִּי 7 *j*

הֵבוּ 36 *d*, *211*

הֲבֵיאתָ 37 *u*

הֲבֵיאתִיו 37 *u*

הֲבֵל 47 *b*, *t*, *391*, *411*

הִבָּרוּ 27 *c*

הַבְּרָכָה 72 *g*

הגוֹ *159*, 35 *d*

הָגְלַת 40 *b*, *c'*, *302*

הִדּוֹשׁ *158*, 37 *p*

הִדַּשְּׁנָה 27 *b*, *e*, *166*

הַהֵכִין 88 *d*, *684*

הֶהָלְכוּא 7 *a*, *47*, 88 *d*, *684*

הַהִלָּלָה 88 *d*, *684*

הַהִקְדִּישׁ 88 *d*, *684*

הֶהָרוֹתֶיהָ 88 *b*

הוּא 7 *a*, *47*

הֱוֵא 40 *e'*

הוֹבְאִישׁ 36 *k*

הוּבָאת (in our text הָבָאת) 37 *u*

הוּדַע (Hof'al) 36 *h*, *215*

הֱוֵה, הוָה 40 *e'*

הֱוִי 40 *e'*

הוּכָּה 7 *c*, *52*

הוּכַן (in our text הוּכַן) *370*

הוּלֶּדֶת 36 *g*

הוּלְּלוּ 7 *c*, *52*

הוֹמִיָּה 40 *n*

הוֹרַדְתָּנוּ 30 *e*

הוּתַל 24 *a*, *127*, *142*, *51 a*, *441*

הִזְדַּמִּנְתּוּן 1 *c*, 7

הִזְהִירֹה *48*, 7 *t* (*b*)

הַזּוּרֶה 37 *q*

הִזִּילוּהָ *220*, 37 *p* (*a*), *253*

*הֵזִיעַ etc. 36 *o*, *233*

הִזַּכּוּ 27 *c*, *165*

הַזְכַּרְכֶם 25 *j b*

הֶחְבְּאַתָה (in our text הֶחְבְּאָתָה) 37 *t*, 39 *g*, *298*

הֶחָבֵה 39 *a*

הֶחֱדַלְתִּי 25 *d*, *149*

הֶחֱזִיקִי (Inf.) 25 *j*, *157*

הֶחֱטִי, הַחֲטִי 39 *i*, *299*

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

הֶחֱיִ, הָחַי 9 *k*, 12 *b*, *78*

הַחֵל 38 *p*, *287*

הַחִלּוֹתָ 37 *l*, 271 *a*, 38 *o*

הַחִלָּם 38 *o*

הֶחֲמָנִים 12 *b*, *78*

הֶחֳרִיטִים 12 *b*, *78*

הַחֲרְסָה 22 *r*

הַחִתֹּתָ 37 *l*, 38 *o*

הִטֶּהֲרוּ 27 *b*

הִטַּהֲרוּ 27 *b*

הִטֶּהַרְנוּ (in our text

הִטַּהַרְנוּ) 27 *c*

הֱטִיבוֹתָ 37 *l*, *250*

הִטַּמָּאָה 27 *c*, *166*

הַיְאוֹר 12 *a*

הִיא 7 *v* (*a*)

הִיא 7 *a*, *47*

הֻיְדוֹת 40 *g*', *332*

הֱיֵה (Inf.) 40 *d*, *303*

הָיָה לֶחֶם (in our text הָיָה) 16 *g*

הַיּוֹלֵד 24 *k*, *142*

הַיּוֹצֵאת 36 *m*

הַיּוֹתֵר 23 *b*, *116*

הַיְחָבְרְךָ 24 *j*, *127*, *144*

הֱיטִיבוֹתִי 37 *l*, *250*

הֵיךְ 7 *t*

הֵילִיכִי 36 *p*, *235*

הַיְצֵא 36 *i*

הֲיִקַּח 24 *k*, *146*

הַיְשַׁר 25 *j* [b], 36 *i*

הָ יְ תָ–הָ יְ תָ ה 40 *a*

הַיְתַד 88 *b*

הִכַּבֵּס 27 *e*, *166*

הַכֵּיתִי 41 *a*

הֶכְלַמְנוּם 25 *a*

הַכֵּנוּ 37 *l*

הֶלְאָה 52 *f*, *459*, *608*

הֶלְאָת *105*, 40 *b*, *z*, *302*

הַלּוֹט 37 *p* (*b*), *255*

הַלְרִים 12 *a*

הַלָּז, הַלָּזֶה, הַלֵּזוּ 11 *c*, *74*

הַלְיהִי 75 *e*, *625*

הלך 36 *p*

הֲלְכוּא 7 *a*, *47*

הַלְלוּ הַלְלוּיָהּ 24 *a*

הַמְּאָנִים 24 *a*, *135*, 48 *a*

הַמְּבַלְעֲדֵי 74 *d*

*הֲמִיךְ 187 *a*

הֻמְכוּ 38 *v*, *273*

הֲמִלָּה 64 *p*

הַמְּלֶכֶת 22 *t*

הַמַּמְלְכוֹת 88 *b*

הֲמָנֶכֶם (Inf.) 31 *a*, *176*

הִמְסִיר *40 h*', *333*

הֲמָסִים 64 *o*, *545*

הַמְעֻלַּם 41 *e*

הַמְעֻשָּׁקָה 12 *a*

הִמְצִיתִיךָ (for הִמְצֵאתִיךָ) 39 *a*

הַמְצַפְצְפִים 42 *e*, *355*

הֲמִתֶּם 37 *l*

הַמְתַעֲבִים 12 *a*

הַנִּבְאִים 23 *h*, *121*

הֲנִגְלֹה (as a corroborative) 87 *b*, *679*

הִנְדּוֹף 25 *j*, *158*, 34 *d*, 60 *s*

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

הַנְחַת 25 *j*

הֵנִיחַ־הַנִּיחַ 36 *l*, *220*

*הֶנְמִיךְ 187 *a*, 138 *v*

הִנְמְצְאוּ 88 *d*, *684*

הַנִּמְצְאִים 23 *h*, *121*, 39 *f*

הִנֵּה־נָא 72 *b*, 73

הִנְנִי 73 *a*

הַנֹּפֶלֶת 22 *t*

הַנִּרְאָה 88 *d*, *684*

הִנָּתוֹךְ 23 *f*

הִסַּג 37 *p* (*a*), *253*

הָסֵר־הַס (in our text הֲסַר) 40 *v*, *317*

הֲסִירִים 35 *f*

הִסִּיתְךָ *220*, 37 *p* (*a*), *253*

הַסָּתָה 37 *v*, *266–7*

הֶעֱבַרְתָּ 25 *a*, *147*

הַעִוְּרִים 12 *b*, *77*

הַעֲזָה 38 *v*

הַעִידֹתִי 37 *l*

הַעִירֹתִי 37 *l*

הֶעֱלָה *147*, 40 *y*

הָעֳלָה, הָעֳלָתָה *147*, 40 *c'*

הֶעֶרְכְּךָ 88 *b*

(הִפְלָא=) הִפְלָה 39 *a*, *294*

(הִפְלֵאתִי=) הִפְלֵיתִי 39 *a*, *294*

הֲפִתִּיתָ 38 *w*, *293*

הַצְפַרְדְּעִים 12 *a* [a]

הַקְּהֵלֶת 88 *c*

הֲקִימוֹתִי *271 a*

הֲקִיצוֹתִי 37 *l*

הִצִּיתוּ 34 *h*

הֲקִלּוֹתַנִי 38 *o*

הִקְצוֹת 40 *a'*, 321

הַרְאִיתֶם *58*, 72 *g*

הֲרֹב־דְּבָרִים 38 *i*, *280*

הִרְגִּיז (Inf.) 25 *j*, 157

הִרְגִּיעַ (Inf.) 25 *j*, *157*

הָרָה 64 *c*, *537*

הרו וְהגו *159*, 35 *d*, 37 *p* (*b*), 40 *g'*, *331*

הָרוֹ 40 *f*, *305*

הָרוֹת־, הָרוֹתֵיהֶם 66 *u'*, *581*

הַרְחֵק 25 *j* [b]

הֲרִיוֹתָיו 66 *u'*, *579*

הֲרִמּוּ 37 *v*, 38 *m*, *284*

הֲרוֹתֵךְ 66 *o'*

הַרְעִימָה 16 *a*, *52*, *84*

הִשְׁאִלְתִּיהוּ 25 *a*

הִשָּׁבְעָה־לִּי 7 *j*

הִשְׁבַּעְתָּנִי 30 *d*

הֲשִׁיבֹתוּ 37 *l*

הָשַׁמָּה *22*, *253*

הִשְׁמִידָם (Inf.) 25 *j*, *157*

הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה 40 *h'* (*e*), *338*

הִתְאַוִּיתֶם *341*

הִתְוִיתָ 40 *h'*, *341*

הִתּוּךְ 25 *j* [a], *158*, 60 *s*

הַתּוֹעֵבוֹת 88 *b*

הֵתָיו 7 *t* (*a*), 40 *g*, 306 *a*

הֵתֶל 24 *a*, *127*

הָתֵל 24 *a*, *127*

הֲתִלֹּתָ *127*

הֲתִמּוּ (in our text הֲתִמּוּ) 38 *v*

הֲתִימְךָ 38 *c*, *v*

הִתְפָּֽקְדוּ *166* (*see* Additions and Corrections p. 377)

הָתְפָּֽקְדוּ 27 *b*, *e*, *166* (*see* Additions and Corrections p. 377)

ו as a vowel-letter 7 *a*; in place of yod 7 *u;* as conjunctive 86; its punctuation 75 *f*, *g*; its functions 86; introducing word, phrase, or incident 86 *a*, *672–3*; in the sense of *or* 86 *b*; introducing a verb in the pluperfect 86 *c*; in place of כַּאֲשֶׁר 86 *d*, *675*; indicating comparison 86 *e*; introducing an apodosis 86 *f*; in place of ב *instrumenti* 86 *g*; introducing a question or protasis beginnin with לֹא 86 *h*, *677*; in the sense of *with* 82 *h*, 86 *i*; as an adversative conjunction 86 *j*; elision of, 89 *f*, *689*; with verbal forms (consecutive and copulative) 21; vocalization of 21 *b–h*; pronunciation of וְ before במף 21 *d**.

וָאַבֶּדְךָ 35 *c*, *g*, *196*

וָאוֹצְרָה 35 *e*, *199*

וָאֶחֱזֶי־בָהּ 18 *d*

וָאַחַר 35 *f*, *201*

וָאֲכַסֵּךְ (anomalously) 21 *h*, *103*

וָאֶכְרֶהָ 16 *a*, *52*, *84*, 41 *f*, *344–5*

וָאֲלַקְטָה 20 *a*, *98*

וָאֲמֹתְתֵהוּ (anomalously) 21 *h*°, *103*

וָאֲנוּשָׁה 19 *c*

וָאֲסָעֲרֵם 33 *g*, *184*, *306*

וָאֲעַנֶּה, וָאֹעְשִׁיר 35 *c*

וָאֵקַל *96*, 38 *d*

וָאֶקְרָאֶה 20 *b*, *99*

וּבְפָרְשְׂכֶם 31 *c*

וּבְצָעֵם 29 *h*, *169*

וּבְקָצְרְכֶם 31 *i*

וּבָשֵׁל 17 *a*, *87*, 24 *a*

וּבִתְקוֹמְמֶיךָ 37 *v*, *264*, 59 *m*

וְגָדֵל 17 *a*, *87*

וָדוֹשִׁי 37 *f*

וְדִיגוּם 37 *l*, *251*

וְהֶאֱזְנִיחוּ 25 *c*, *148*

וְהִבְדִילָה, וְהֵבִיאָה (milra') 25 *a*

וְהֲבֵיאתִי 37 *u*

וְהֹרוֹ *see* הֹגה

וְהוֹלֵיד 36 *h*

וְהוֹשְׁבוֹתִים 36 *q*

וְהֶחֱצִיוֹ 88 *b*

וַהֲסִיבוֹתִי 37 *l*, *250*

וַהֲסַלְתִי 37 *l*

וְהַיּוֹלְדָה 88, *683*

וְהִכִּיתָ (in our text וְהִכֵּיתָ) 16 *h*

וְהִמְלִיט 25 *j*, *157*

וַהֲמַתָּה 37 *l*

וַהֲמִתִיו 7 *c*, *52*, 37 *l*

וַהֲמִתִיהָ 37 *l*

וַהֲמִתֶּם, וַהֲמִתֶּן 37 *l*

וְהִנִּיחָה 36 *l* b, *220*
וְהֶעֱלֵיהָ 88 *d*, *684*
וְהֶקֱאתוֹ 37 *l*
וְהִרְצָת *105*, 40 *z*
וְהִשְׁלַכְתֶּנָה 25 *f*, *157*
וְהִתְגַּדִּלְתִּי 27 *d*
וְהִתְגָּר 40 *d'*
וְהִתְנַחַלְתֶּם אוֹתָם 27 *f*
וְהִתְקַדִּשְׁתִּי— 27 *d*
וְהִתְקַדִּשְׁתֶּם
וְהִתְשׁוֹטַטְנָה 27 *c*, *162*
וְחָטָאת 39 *b*
וְחַי 40 *f'*, *324 a*, *b*
וָחַי *324 a*
וְחָיָה 40 *f'*, *324*
וָחְיֵה 40 *g*
וַחֲמִשִּׁים 69 *m*, *602 m*
וְטֵאטֵאתִיהָ 42 *d*
וּטֳהָר— 49 *e*, *431*
וַיֹּאסֶף (from יסף) 36 *p*, *235 a*
וַיָּאצֶל 35 *f*, *199 a*
וַיֵּאת (in our text וַיֵּאת) 40 *j*
וַיְאֶתָיֶנִי 41 *b*
וַיֵּבְךְּ 4 *e*. *31–2*, 40 *j*
וַיְבַקְשֵׁהוּ 35 *c*, *195*, 36 *j*
וַיְבַשׁוּ—וַיֵּבְשׁוּ 36 *j*
וַיְגֹדֵד 33 *b*
וַיִּגֶה 40 *g'*
וַיְגַל 40 *q*, *314*
וַיְגָרְשֵׁם (anomalously) 33 *j*, *186*
וַיִּגַּשׁ 34 *j*
וַיִּדְבְּקוּ 25 *k*, 35 *c*, *195*
וַיִּדּוּ 40 *g'*
וַיִּדְרְכוּ 35 *c*, *195*
וַיְהַתֵּל *127*
וַיּוֹחֶר 35 *f*
וְיוֹלַדְתְּ 26 *a*, *160*
וַיּוֹסֶף (from אסף) 35 *b*, *235 a*
וַיָּזֶד 34 *k*, *189*
וַיִּחַדְּ 4 *g*, *33*, 40 *j*
וַיָּחֶל 36 *f*, *213*
וַיְחַלֶּא 39 *a*
וַיְחָלוּ (in our text וַיְחָלוּ) 16 *a* (*see* Additions and Corrections, p. 376), *52*, *84*, 75 *d*
וַיְחַלְּקֵם (in our text וַיְחַלְּקֵם) 33 *g*, *183*
וַיֶּחֱמוּ 36 *n*, *228*
וַיֵּחַמְנָה 22 *n*, 36 *n*, *228*, *230*
וַיְחָנֵּךְ 30 *a*, *171–2*
(וַיְחַפּוּ =) וַיְחַפְּאוּ 39 *a*
וַיֵּיחֶל 36 *f*, *212*
וַיִּיף 40 *g'*
וַיִּישֶׂם *212*, 36 *k*, *219*
וַיַּכּוֹ 83 *a*, *655*
וַיַּכְּתוּם 35 *c*, *195*, *253*, *273*
וִילַדְתְּ 40 *j*
וִילַלַת 75 *d*
וַיַּלִּינוּ 37 *p* (*a*), *253*
וַיִּמְאַס 38 *a*, *270*

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

וַיָּסֶב *253, 273*
וַיַּסַּע 34 *j*
וַיֹּסֶף (from אסף) 35 *b*, *235 a*
וַיִּסַר 37 *g*, *246*
וַיְסָרְנִי 29 *c*, 36 *l*
וַיִּעַט 37 *g*, *246*
וַיִּעַף 37 *g*, *246*
וַיִּפְתְּ 4 *e*, *31–2*, 40 *j*
וַיִּצְקוּם 36 *l* [a]
וַיִּצֶק (in our text וַיִּצֶק) 36 *l*
וַיִּצְקוּ (in our text וַיִּצְקוּ) 36 *l*, *222*
וַיֵּרָא 40 *b'*, *h'* (*c*), *335*
וַיָּרֶב 35 *f*, *199 a*
וַיֵּרֶד 40 *j*
וַיָּרֶם 38 *g* [a], *277*
וַיִּרְמוּ 37 *v*, 38 *m*, *284*
וַיְּרַפּוּ 39 *i*
וַיְרַפּוּ 39 *i*
וִירִשְׁתֶּם 22 *j*
וַיֵּשְׁבְּ 4 *e*, *31–2*, 40 *j*
וַיְשַׁנּוֹ 83 *a*, *655*
וַיָּשַׁר 36 *j*
וַיָּשַׁר 34 *k*, *189*
וַיְשַׁרְנָה 22 *n*, 36 *l*, *230*
וַיֵּתֵא 35 *f*, *202*
וַיִּתְיַלְדוּ 27 *b*
וַיִּתֹּם *253, 273*
וַיִּתְּמוּ 38 *d*, *v*, *273*
וְכִלְכְּלוּ 42 *e* (*b*)
וְכִעֲסַתָּה 29 *g*
וּלְמַסַּע 78 *d*, *638*
וְלַנְפִּיל 25 *j*
וּלְשׁוֹטֵט 26 *a*
וּמְאַסִּפְכֶם 24 *d*
וּמְסַפֵּר 78 *d*, *637–8*
וּמְשַׁלֵּחַ 78 *d*, *638*
וְנֹאחֲזוּ 35 *a*
וְנִאשְׁאַר 23 *m*, *126*
וַנָּבֶל 34 *k*, *188*, *213*
וְנֶהְפֹּךְ 23 *g*, *120*
וְנוֹדֵד 37 *a*, *239*
וְנִוַּסְּרוּ 23 *l*, *125*
וְנִחְתֹּם 23 *g*, *120*
וַנִּירָם 40 *g'*
וְנִכְחַת 22 *a*, *105*
וְנִכַּפֵּר 23 *l*, *125*
וְנִלְווּ (Imp.) 23 *d*, *118*
וְנֶעֶבְדֵם 19 *c*, *127*
וְנֶעְתַּר 23 *g*, *120*
וַנַּעֲשֶׂה 40 *k*, *307 a*
וְנִצְּתָה 34 *h*
וְנִקְבְּצוּ (Imp.) 23, *118*
וְנָשָׂא 40 *g'*
וַנָּשִׂים 35 *c*, 38 *p*, *289*
וְנִשְׁלַח 23 *d*, *120*
וְסוּרַי 45 *d*
וְסַעֲדָה 18 *b*
וָעֵד 63 *d*, 64 *c*, *536*
וּפִילַגְשֵׁהוּ 46 *e*, *386*
וּפְעָלוֹ 47 *c'*, *414*
וּפִשְׁתִּים 22 *j*, 37 *e*, *244*
וְצַעֲקִי 18 *d*
וְקָבְנוֹ 32 *d*, *181*, 38 *a*
וְקַוֵּי 22 *v*
וְקָרַב 24 *a* [b]

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

וּרְאַיְנָה (in our text וּרְאֶיְנָה) 36 *m*, *224*
וְשָׂרַי 45 *d*
וְשַׁבֵּחַ 24 *c*, *135*
וְשָׁבַת 22 *b*, *249*, *261*
וּשְׂכַרַת 22 *y*, *207 a*
וְשָׁמַע (in our text וּשְׁמָע) 21 *d*
וְתֶאֱרוֹ *91*, 47 *c'*, *414*
וְתָבֹאָה *261*
וְתַגִּיד 25 *k*
וַתִּגְבְּהֶינָה 22 *n*
וַתְּהַלַּךְ 19 *c*
וַתְּהֳרֶיןָ 22 *n*
וַתִּזְנִי־ 40 *l*, *309*
וַתַּזְרֵנִי 35 *g*, *203*
וַתַּחַשׁ 37 *g*, *246*
וַתִּיסְפִי 40 *g'*
וְתִכּוֹנֵן 37 *v*
וַתְּכַל (דָּוִד) 82 *b*, *650*
וַתָּנַח 37, *246*
וַתִּנְחַת 34 *h*
וְתִנַּשֵּׂא *125*, 27 *c*
וַתֶּעְגַּב (in our text וַתַּעְגַּב) 19 *c*
וַתַּעְגְּבָה 19 *b*, 20 *c*
וְתַעֲלוּמָהּ (in our text וְתַעֲלוּמָה) 59 *c*, 500 *a*
וּתְפוֹצוֹתִיכֶם 37 *p* (*b*), *256*
וַתִּצְפְּנוּ 82 *d*, *652*
וַתָּרָץ 37 *n*
וַתֵּרֶץ 39 *a*
וַתִּשְׁחֲדִי 22 *l*
וַתָּשֶׂם 35 *f*, *201–2*
וַתִּתַיַּצֵּב 36 *l*, *221*
וַתִּתְצוּ 6 *c*

זְבְחוֹתָם 45 *j*, *379*
זֹה–זוֹ 11 *a*
זוּ 11 *a*, *72*
*זָוִיָּה–זָוִית–זָוִיּוֹת 66 *u'*
זוּלָתִי 74 *e*, *617*
זֵידוֹנִים 63 *j*
זֵיתִים *514*
זָכוּר (in active meaning) *642*
זְלוּת 55 *b*
זְמָן–זְמַנִּים 47 *m*
זַמְּרָה 24 *a*
זְמַתְכֻּנָה 46 *f*, *388*
זְנוּתֵיכֶם 45 *j*, *380*
זַעֲוָה–זַעַת 36 *o*, 62 *j*
זְעָמָה 18 *b*, *91*, 40 *c'*
זֹרוּ 37 *r*, *259*
זְרְמוּ *159*
זֵרֶת 63 *p*, *525*

חֲבֶרְתְּךָ 54 *b*
חֲבִתִּים 49 *g*, *435*
חִבֵּל 24 *a* (p. 86)
חָגָא 64 *t*
חֲגוֹרָה (anomalously) 18 *d*, *94*
חַד 69 *a*
חָדֵלוּ 6 *b*, 16 *a* *, *84*
חֲדַר 47 *b*, *391*, 47 *t*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

חוֹטָא 39 h
*חומשים *475 a*
חוֹרָי 45 d, *373*
חֲזוּ (in our text חָזוּ) 40 c
חַטָּאַי 48 c, 65 c
חטְאים *121*, 39 h
חָטָאת 39 b
חַטָּאת 65 l
חֲטֹאתוֹ 39 h
חִטִּים 63 t
חִטִּין 45 f
חַי (verb) 40 f'; *324*
חַי (adj.) 40 f', *324*
חֵי 40 f', *324 a, b*
חָיָה 40 f', *324*
חָיוֹת 40 f', *324*
חַיִּין 45 f
חַיָּיכִי 46 i, *389*
חַיְתוֹ *111*
חַכֵּי 40 l, *310*, *636*
חָכְמוֹת *461*
חָכְמַת 45 a, *395*
חֲלָאִים 66 h
חֲלֵב 47 b
חֶלְבֵּיהֶן 46 g
חַלּוֹנֵי (abs.) 45 b, *371*
חַלּוֹנָי 45 d, *373*
חַלְּוֹתִי 38 e, *274 a*, 40 t, *316*
חֳלִי (in our text חֳלִי) 3 a
חִלֵּץ 24 a
חַלְקֵי 48 a, *418*
חִלְקָתָה 29 g
חֹם (adj.) 38 i
חָם *565*
חֲמָה (constr.) 45 a, *367*
חָמוֹת 55 b, *565*, 66 y'
חֶמְלָה *457*
חֶמְצָתוֹ 52 f
חֳמַרְמָרָה 42 f (b), *60 a*, *357*
חֳמַרְמְרוּ 42 f (b), *357*
חֲמֵשׁ 47 i
חֲמִשִּׁיתָיו 55 k, *479*
חֲמַת 62 j
חַנּוֹת 38 e, *274 a*
*חנות–חֲנֻיּוֹת *531*, 66 r', *575a*
חֲנִית–חֲנִיתִים 66 q'
חִנָּם 64 u
חָנֵּנִי 38 h
חָנְנֵנִי 38 u, *290 a*
חֲמוֹתָהּ 66 y'
חֲסָיָה, חֲסָיוּ 40 a, *301*
חֲפַצֵי 47 i
חִצְבִי 22 s, *111*
חֲצוֹת 66 p'
חֳרָבָה 52 h
חַרְבוֹנֵי (in our text חַרְבוֹנֵי) 56 a, *481*
חִרְדוּ (2nd pers., fem., plur.) 18 d
חֲרֻלִּים 49 g, *435*
חָרָשׁ, חֲרָשִׁים 48 e, *425*
חֲשׂוּפֵי 45 d, *373*

Digitized by Google   Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

חֳשִׁים *37 p* (*b*)
*חֳתָלָה *53 l, 473*

טֲאטֵאתִיהָ 42 *d*, *253*
טוּב 37 *p* (*b*), *258 a*
טוּרִים (constr.) 45 *a*, *367*
טַלְטֵלָה (constr.) 45 *b*, *370*
טַפְסְרַיִךְ 67 *b*
טֹרַף *635*

י as a vowel-letter 7 *a*, in place of ן or א 7 *v*, latent but pronounced 7 *q*
יֵאוֹר *218*
יְאַחֲזוּךְ 33 *a*
יֵאָכֵל *201, 623*
יֶאְשְׁמוּ 35 *h*
יֵאָתוּ 36 *k*, *218*
יֶאֱתָיוּ 40 *a*, *301*
יָבֹא 37 *s*
יֵבוֹשׁ—יֵבוֹשׁוּ *96*, *36 k*, *218*
יְבָזּוּם 38 *h*
יַבְּמִי 31 *f*, *178*
יְבִמְתִּי 54 *b*
יִבְנֶה—בַּיִת 7 *h*
יְבֻשֶׁת 36 *b*
יַגִּיד 25 *k*
יְגַמֵּא *270*
יָגֹר—יָגֻר *253*
יַגֵּשׁ 34 *j*
יָד—יֶדְכֶם 66 *r*

יְדֻהוּ (in our text יְדֻיהוּ) 46 *e*, *386*
יַדוּ 40 *g*', *330*
יִדַּחוּ 40 *q*, *313*
יְדֵי 45 *d*
יְדֶכָה 46 *c*
יִדֵּל *96*, 37 *p* (*a*), *253*
יִדֹּם *253*, *273*
יִדְּמוּ *253*, 38 *d*, *v*, *273*
יָדֹן (in our text יָדוֹן) 37 *p* (*b*), *253 a*
יְדָעֻן 22 *i*, *106*
יִדְּעוֹנִי 56 *f*
יְדֻשְּׁנֶה 20 *b*, *99*
יְהֻדֳּפֵם 20 *a*
יְהוּא 40 *e*', *323*
יְהוֹדֶה 36 *i*, 40 *g*'
יהוה (with prefixes) 75 *e*
יְהוֹשִׁיעַ *84*, 25 *a*, *k*, 36 *i*
יְהִי—יֶהִי 40 *e*'
יְהֵילִילוּ *84*, 25 *a*, *k*, 36 *i*
יַהֵל 35 *f*, *200*
יְהָתֵלּוּ 16 *a*, *84*, *127*
יוֹדַעְתִּי 26 *a*, *160*
יוּחָקוּ (in our text יֻחֲקוּ) 38 *v*
יוּכַל 36 *p*, *234*
יוּלָּד 7 *c*, *52*, 24 *k*, *142*, 51 *b*, *442*
יוֹסִיף (adj.) 22 *o*, *109*, 30 *e*, *173*
יוֹסֵף (from אסף) 35 *b*
יוֹצֵת 36 *m*
יוּקָשִׁים 24 *a*, *142*

Digitized by Google   Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

יוֹרֶה *206*
יוֹשַׁבְתְּ 26 *a*, *160*
יוּשַּׁד 38 *t*
יְעֻמֻּהוּ 33 *a*
יַחַד–יַחַד 40 *h*, *307*
יְחַזְיָן 40 *a*, *301*
יְחִי–יְחִי 40 *e'*
יְחִישָׁה . . . וְתָבֹאָה 20 *c*
יְחִיתַן 33 *h*, 38 *q*, *288*
יָחֵל 38 *q*
יְחַלוּ see וַיְחַלוּ
יֵחַם 36 *n*, *229*
יֶחֱמַתְנִי 24 *a*, 36 *n*
יְחָנְךָ 38 *h*, *278*
יְחֻנַּן *283*
יְחָנֵּנוּ 38 *h*
יְחָסִין 40 *a*, *301*
יֵחָרוּ 38 *l*, *283*
יֵחַת 38 *l*, *283*
יֵחָתּוּ 34 *h*
יֵידַע 36 *i*, *216*
יֵיטִיב 36 *i*, *216*
יְיֵלִיל–יְיֵלִילוּ–
יְהֵילִילוּ 36 *i*, *216*
יַיִן 63 *b*
יֵיסַךְ 36 *k*, *212*, *219*
יְכֻלֶּת 36 *b*
יֵיקַר 36 *a*
יֵירֶה 36 *f*, *212*
יֵישִׁירוּ 36 *i*
יְכַבְּדֻנְנִי 30 *a*, *171*
*יָכֹל (etc.) 81 *d*
(יִכְלָא =) יִכְלֶה 39 *a*
יְכָלוּ 16 *f*, *84*
יְכֻלֶּת 36 *b*
יְכַסְיֻמוּ 37 p (*b*), *258*
יְכַרְסְמֶנָּה 42 *a*, *347*
יַכַּת 37 *p* (*a*), *253*
יְלַבְּשֵׁם 33 *g*
יָלֹד *146*
יְלִדְתִּיהוּ 29 *f*
יְלִדְתַּנִי (irregularly) 30 *d*
יִלְכְּדֻנוּ 33 *i*, *185*
יָם– 64 *b*
יְמָאֲסוּ 38 *a*, *270*
יָמוּךְ 38 *g*
יָמוֹל *187 a*
יָמִים *514*, 63 *e*, *520*
יָמִין (plur.) 45 *f*
יָמֹּךְ 38 *b*, *253*
(יְמַלֵּא =) יְמַלֶּה 39 *a*
יִמַּס 38 *d*, *273*
יִמָּצֵה 40 *p*, *307 a*
יִמְצָאֻנְהָ 33 *f*, *182*
יֵמַר 38 *d*, *l*, *283*
יְנָאֵץ 37 *v*, *265*
יִנְטוֹר 34 *i*
יָנִי 37 *u*
יִנָּשׁוּא 39 *a*
יִסֹּב 237 *p* (*a*), *253*, 38 *d*, *273*
יְסֹבְבֻנְהוּ 30 *a*, *171*
יְסֻּד (in our text יְסַּד) 48 *b*, *420*
יַסִּית *220*, 37 *p* (*a*), *253*
יִסָּעוּ 34 *m*
יְסֹעֵר *159*

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

יַסֹּר–יִסֹּר 24 a (p. 86), *129*
יַסְרָה 24 a
יִסְּרַנִּי 30 a, *171*
יַעַבְרֶנְהוּ 30 a, *171*
יְעַלְעוּ 37 v, *262*
יָעֵלַת–יְעֵלִים 52 e, *456*
יַעֲמִדְנָה 22 n, *230*
יָעֲנַת–יְעֵנִים 52 e, *458*
יְעֹעֲרוּ 37 v, *263*
יַעְרִים (in our text יַעְרָם) 78 b, *635*
יַעֲשֶׂה (in our text יַעֲשֶׂה) 40 k, *307 a*
יַעְשְׁרֶנּוּ 25 k, 35 c, *195*
יְפַגְּשְׁךָ 33 a
יְפֵה־פִיָּה 57 r, *490*
יְפֵיפִית 42 d, *354*
יַפְתְּ 4 e, *31–2*
יְצָא 36 m
יְצָאנִי 38 k, *282*, 83 b
יצב, יצג, יצק, יצר 36 l
יַצַר, יָצְרוּ 36 l, *223*
יִצְּרֶנְהוּ 30 a, *171*
יצת 36 l
יַצְּתוּ 34 h
יְקַבֶּנּוּ 20 a, 33 a
יָקְדְעָם 4 f
יְקָהַת 6 b, 16 a, 52, 84
יֻקַּח 24 k, *146*
יַקַּח 6 a, (c)
יְקָחוּ 6 c, 34 m
יִקְטְלֶנָּה, יִקְטְלֶנָּה, יִקְטְלֶנְהוּ, יִקְטְלֶנּוּ 33 f, *182*
יְקַלּוּ 38 l, *283*
יֵקַר (in our text יֵקָר) 47 l
יִקְרֶא (= יִקְרֶה) 39 a
יִקְרָאֻהוּ 33 a
יִקְרָאוּ 33 a, e
יִקְרָה (= יִקְרֶה) 39 a
יְקָרֵךְ 41 f, *345*
יָקְתְאֵל 4 f
יְרֹאוּ 36 m, *226*
יִרְאִיָּה 6 d
יְרָאֻנִי 41 b
יֵרֵד 40 b'
יִרַדֹּף 27 f, *167*
יִרְדְּפוּ 33 e
יִרְדָּפְךָ 33 a
יָרוּן 38 g
יְרוּשָׁלַםִ 7 q
יְרַסְנִי 36 q, *236*
יֵרֵךְ *96*, *253*
יַרְכָתוֹ *252*
יַרְכְּתֵי *252*, 45 j
יֵשֶׁט 40 j
יְשִׂמֵם 33 g
יְשֹׁשׁוּם 33 g, 83 b, *659*
יִשָּׂשכָר 6 d
יֵשׁ (with suffixes) 66 w, *566*, 72 c, *606*
יְשָׁדְדֵם, יְשָׁדֵּם 38 h, *279*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

יָשׁוֹב (Inf. of שׁוּב) 37 *v*, *268*
יָשׁוּד 38 *g*
יְשׁוּעָתָה 37 *t*, *298*, *365*
יְשַׁחֵךְ 36 *k*, 40 *h* (*e*), *237*
יָשִׂים 35 *c*, 38 *q*, *289*
יָשֵׂם 35 *c*, 37 *p* (*a*), *253*, 38 *d*, *273*
יִשְׁנֶא (= יִשְׁנֶה) 39 *a*
יְשַׁנֶּא (= יְשַׁנֶּה) 39 *a*
יְשַׁעֲךָ 47 *w*
יִשְׁפּוֹטוּ 19 *a*, 36 *k*, 37 *g*
יְשָׁרְתוּנֶךָ 33 *h*
יִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּן 40 *a*, *301*
יִתְאָו 40 *d'*
יִתֹּם 38 *l*
יִתֵּן 24 *k*, *146*
יִתְנֶחָם 9 *h*
יִתְקְפוֹ 33 *e*

כ preposition 75 *b*; punctuation 75 *b–f*; with suffixes 76; with interrogative particle מָה 75 *h*; its functions 85 *i–k*; introducing comparisons or definiteness 85 *j*; indicating approximation 85 *k*; כְּ–כְּ signifying absolute equality 85 *v*, *670*; elision of, 89 *c*
כָּאוֹר 12 *a*, *76*
כַּאבִּיר 7 *c*, *199 a*
כְּאֵיפָה (cstr.) 45 *a*, *367*
כֵּאלֹהִים *201*, 75 *c*, *623*
כְּבוּדָה 7 *c*, *52*
כְּבַחֲצִי 85 *k*, *665*
כְּבִכּוּרָה 59 *c*
*כִּבְשׂנוֹת 56 *b*
כַּגְּבִרְתָּהּ 88 *b*
כְּדָרֵי 47 *o*, *405*
כַּדְכֹּד 7 *l*, *54*
כְּדָמָה (in our text כְּדֻמָּה) 37 *p* (*b*)
כּוֹבַע 49 *a*
כּוּלָם 7 *c*, *52*
כִּי (noun) 66 *q*, *560*
כְּיַיִן (absol.) 63 *b*
כַּיְעֵנִים 12 *a*
כְּיִתְרוֹן 75 *d*
כִּכְּרַיִם 45 *h*, *421*
כֹּל (Inf. of יָכֹל) 36 *c*, *208*
כָּל *22*, 64 *a*
(כָּלִיתִי =) כָּלֶאתִי 39 *h*
כֻּלֹּה 46 *e*, *386*
כֻּלְּהֶם 64 *a*
כֻּלְּהֶנָּה 64 *a*
כֻּלֹּו 40 *c*
(כָּלְאוּ =) כָּלוּ 39 *a*
כָּלוּ 24 *c*, *52*
כֵּלִים–כְּלֵי 66 *h*, *549*
כַּלְכֵּל 7 *l*, *54*
כָּלְכְּלוּ 42 *e*
כֻּלָּנָה 46 *g*
כֵּלַפּוֹת 47 *g*
כְּמוֹ 75 *b*, *622*
כַּגְלוֹתְךָ 40 *h'* (*b*), *334*
כִּנֹּרוֹת 54 *d*
כַּסּוּחָה 53 *d*, *468*
כֻּסֶּמֶת–כֻּסְּמִים 54 *g*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

כְּסָפִים—כַּסְפֵּיהֶם 44 *c*

כִּסְתוֹתֵיכֶנָה 46 *f*, *388*

כַּפֹּרוֹת 53 *j*, *469*

כְּפָרִים 47 *a'*, *413*

כְּקְסָם (in our text כְּקָסוּם) 3 *f*

כָּרִי (plur.) 45 *c*, *372*

כְּרִיתֻתֶיהָ 55 *d*

כרסם *see* יְכַרְסְמֶנָּה

כָּרַת 24 *d*, *52*

כָּרְתוּ or כֻּרְתוּ 3 *h*, *23*

כְּשַׁךְ 38 *e*, *274**

כְּתַב (in our text כְּתָב) 47 *l*

כִּתְבוּנָם 63 *t*

*כִּתְבֵי *400*

כְּתֻנּוֹת 52 *f*

כֶּתֶף (cstr.) 47 *j*, *397*

כַּתַּר־ 24 *a*

ל preposition 75 *b*; punctuation 75 *b–g*; with suffixes 76 *a*; with interrogative particle מה 75 *h*; functions 85 *l–r*; indicating direction 85 *l*; relative to the object in the accusative or nominative 74 *b*, 85 *m*, *666*; reflexive use 85 *n*, *667*; in place of בְּ or עַל in a local sense 85 *o*, *p*, *668*; in the sense of *in*, *reference to*, *on account of*, 85 *q*; in place of the definite article 85 *r*; לְ–לְ in appositive sense 85 *v*; omitted or replaced by locative ־ָה 89 *d*.

לָאדוֹנִי . . . 75 *e*

לָאוֹר 37 *j*

לֵאלֹהִים 201, 75 *c*, *623*

לֵאמֹר 7 *c*, *201*, 75 *c*, *623*

לֵאמֹר (after מֹשֶׁה) 7 *c*, *49*

לֶאְסֹר *623*

לָאָרֶץ 85 *o*, *668*

לְבַדְהֶן, לְבַדֶּנָה 46 *g*

לְבְּהֶן 46 *g*

לָבוֹר 38 *e*

לָבִיא 25 *j*

לְבֶן־ 47 *b*, *391*

לְבָרָם 38 *e*, *274*

לְדַאֲוָה (in our text לְדָאֲבָה) 17 *b*

לֵדָה,* לֵידָתוֹ, *לֵידָתָן 62 *j*, *510*

לְדַרְיוֹשׁ 17 *d*

לֶהָבָה, לַהֲבוֹת 53 *b*, *465*

*לְהִבָּרְאוֹת 39 *h*

לְהֵדַק 38 *p*, *287*

לְהוֹצִיאָנִי 41 *b*

לְהֶחָבֵה 39 *a*

לַהֲטֵיהֶם 7 *s*

לְהָכִיל 35 *c*, *194*

לְהַנְחוֹתָם *84*

לַהֲנָפָה 37 *m*, *251 a*

לְהַנְתִּיךְ 34 *d*

לְהַפְרְכֶם 37 *m*, *252*

לַהֲשׁוֹת 40 *h'* (*d*), *336*

לוּא 7 *a*, *47*

לֵוִי, לְוִיִּים 45 *e*, *373 a*, 52 *g*

*לְוִיָּה *454*

לוּלִים 52, 63 *e*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

לְוֹצְצִים *37 v, 264*
לְזוּת *573*
לֶחֳדָשִׁים *75 c*
לַחֲלֹק *187 b*
לָחֶם 16 *e*, *85*, 47 *h*, *396*
לֶחֶם 47 *x*
לַחֲמָם 38 *a*, 75 *c*
לְחֶנְוָה 38 *u*
לְחַרְחַר 42 *c*, *e*, *356*
לְוּחוֹתַיִם (in our text
לֻחוֹתָיִם) 45 *j*
*לְשׂוּל 34 *b*, *187 a*
ליהוה *see* יהוה
לִיזְרְעֶאל *28*
לְיַחְמֶנָּה—לְיַחְמֶנָּה 31 *g*, 36 *n*, *232*
לִין *251*
לִיסּוֹד 24 *a*, *129*, 36 *g*, *214*
לִיקְהַת 6 *c*, 16 *a*, *84*, 75 *d*
לִירְאָה *28*
לְכַלֵּא 40 *t*
לְכֻנָּה 76 *a* (*a*), *666 a*
לֶכְתִּי 36 *p* *, *408*
לַלְבֵּן 25 *j*
לָלֶת 36 *b*, *207 a*
לְמִבְּרָאשֹׁנָה 75 *a*, 85 *q*, *669*
לְמַדַּי 75 *a*
לָמָּה *243*
לָמָּה, לָמָה, לָמֶה 75 *h*
לְמוֹ 75 *b*, *622*
*לְמוֹל 34 *b*, *187 a*
לִמְנוּחָתֵיכִי 46 *j*, *389*
לְמִקְצְעוֹת 58 *g*, *497*
לְמַשְּׁאוֹת 40 *c*, *304*, 78 *d*, *638*
לְמַעְלָה *688*
לָנֶה 37 *q*
לַנִּים 37 *q*
לִנְפֹּל 25 *j*, 34 *d*, *187 b*
לְסֹבֵב 5 *c*
לַעֲנוֹת 23 *e*
לַעְשֵׂר 25 *j*, 69 *n*, *603*
*לְפּוֹל 34 *b*, *187 a*
לִצְבֹּא 5 *c*
לַצָּפוֹנָה 89 *d*, *688*
לקח 6 *a* (*c*), *39*, 34 *l*, *190*
לְקַח 24 *k*, *146*
לָקַח *142*, 51 *b*, *442*
לְקַח 34 *m*
לִקְרַאת 65 *k*
לֵרֹא 36 *m*
לֵרָאוֹת 23 *e*
לִרְאוֹתְכֶם 25 *j*
לְרֵד 38 *e*, *274*
לְרַמּוֹתָנִי 41 *b*
לְשִׂטְנוֹ *177*
לִשְׁאֵלָה 89 *d*, *688*
לְתִתִּי 31 *f*
לְתִתֵּן 34 *l*, *190*

מִן, מ preposition 75 *a*; with suffixes 74 *e*, punctuation 75 *a*; its meanings 85 *s–u*; with the comparative 85 *s*; in place of בְּ *in* 85 *t*; pleonastic 85 *u*, elision of, 89 *e*
מֵאָדָם 24 *d*
מְאוּרֵי 58 *c*, *492*
מֵאַחֲרֵי (abs.) 45 *b*, *371*
מֵאָן *50*
מָאֵן 24 *a*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

מְאָסְפָיו 24 *a*, *128*

מָאתַיִם *199 a*

מְבוֹאַי *636*

מַבּוּל 61 *a*, *508*

מִבְטֶחָם 58 *c*

מֶבָּטָהּ *69*

מֵבִי 37 *u*

מַבְלִיגִיתִי 25 *h*, *154*

מְבַעֲתֶךָ 24 *d*, *138*

מִבְצִיר 75 *a*

מִגְבוּרָתָם 75 *a*

מִגַּרְתָּהּ 22 *d*

מִדְבָּרָה 58 *b*

*מִדְבָּרִיּוֹת *471*

מִדַּבְּרוֹתֶיךָ 53 *a*, *466*

מִדָּה 63 *t*

מְדָנִים (kethib) *533*

*מֶדְרָשׁ *68*

מָה, מַה, מֶה 13

מִהְיוֹת 75 *a*

מַהְלְכִים 58 d, *494*

מִהִקָּצְעוֹת 25 *a*

מַהֵר (ptcp.) 48 *a*

מֶהַרְבַּת 40 *a*', *321*

מוֹבָאֶךָ 36 *m*, *224*

מוֹטֵהוּ 46 *e*, *386*

מוּסָּד 36 *g*

מוּסַךְ 64 *j*

מוּעֶדֶת 24 *i*, *142–3*

מוּעָף *155*, *521*

מוֹצָא 39 *h*

מוּצָק 63 *h*, *521*

מוּצֶקֶת 36 *l*ᵃ

מוֹרָד 64 *j*

מֻוְתָה 47 *f*'

מִזְבְּחוֹתָם 45 *j*, *379*

מַזֶּה 7 *c*

מַזִּין 35 *f*, *200–2*

*מזיען 36 *o*, *233*

מִזְרְחָה 58 *b*

מַחְאָךְ 31 *d*, 36 *m*

מְחוּט 75 *a*

מְחוּץ 75 *a*

מֵחֲטוֹ 39 *i*, *299*

מְחִיָּאֵל 6 *d*

מְחֲלָה (cstr.) 45 *a*, *367*

מַחְלְמִים 35 *h*, *153*

מַחְלֶקֶת, מַחְלְקוֹת *469*

מַחְמָאוֹת (in our text מֶחֱמָאוֹת) 75 *a*, *621*

מְחַנֵּךְ (sing.), *570*

מְחַצְצְרִים (in our text מַחְצְצְרִים) 6 *d*

מֵחֲרוֹן (Inf.) 17 *c*

מֶחֱרֶת 52 *f*, *458*

מִטַּחֲוֵי 42 *b*, *352*

מַטָּרָא 7 *s* (*c*), *59*

מַי (abs.) 45 *b*, *371*

מִיַּרְדִּי (in our text מִיַּרְדֵּי) 31 *e*

מַיִם—מֵי—מֵימֵי 45 *k*, *381*, 68 *a*, *589*

מִירֻשָּׁתְךָ 75 *a*

מִיְּשֵׁנֵי 75 *a*

מָךְ 38 *b*

מֻכֵּהוּ (in passive meaning) *642*

מַכּוֹתְךָ, מַכּוֹתָם 45 *j*, *379*, *530*

מַכֹּלֶת 35 c, 58 n, 500
מֶכֶס 64 h, 540
מִכְסָה 540, 64 l
מְכֻרְבָּל 42 a, 348
מְכַרְכַּר 42 e (a), 355
מִכְרָם 156, 177
מַכַּת (abs.) 45 a
מִלְאוֹם 75 a
מְלָאכָה 199 a, 58 l, 499
מַלְאֲכֵי (abs.) 45 b, 371
מַלְאֲכֵכֵה 46 c, 384
מְלֹאת 39 h
מִלֵּאת 39 d, 296, 65 m
מִלֵּאתִי 111
(מלאו =) מָלוּ 39 a
מְלָוֹשְׁנִי 144, 26 a
*מַלִּיחַ 36 m,
מִלִּין 45 f, 374
מַלִּינִים 37 p (a), 253
מַלְכוּת } 5 c, 38
מַלְכֵי }
מַלְכֻיּוֹת, *מַלְכִיּוֹת 454, 471, 55 b, 531
מְלָכִין 45 f, 374
מַלְכֶם 7 c
מַלְפֵנוּ 35 c, g, 200
מְלֻתִי 39 i
מַמְגּוּרוֹת 63 v, 532
מְמוֹתֵי 636
מִמָּחֳרָת (cstr.) 45 a
מִמֶּנּוּ—מִמֶּנּוּ 619
מֶמֶר 64 h, 540, 66 h'
מַמְּרוֹרִים 532
מֶמְשָׁלָה 68
מְנָאוֹת 52 i, 578
מְנָאֵץ 24 j, 145
מְנַהֲגוּ 46 e, 386–7, 74 e
מְנָהוּ 74 e
*מְנָחוֹת 52 d, 455
מְנִי, מְנֵי־ 74 e, 618
מְנָיוֹת 52 i, 578
מָן—מַנְךְ 66 r, 564
*מַנְמִיכוּ 38 v b, 417
מְנָת (cstr.) 45 a, 66 u', 578
מֵסַב 38 r, 539 a
מַסִּית 253
*מַסֶּכְתָּא 68
מַסַּע (Inf.) 40 e, 304, 78 d, 638
מַסְעֵי 34 m
מִסְפָּר (Inf.) 40 e, 304, 78 d, 638
מָסֹרֶת 35 f, 58 m, 500
מְעֻזְנֶיהָ 38 a, 64 d, 539
מַעֲזְרִים 25 h, 153
מְעַשִּׂים 47 m
מְעִי 66 a'', 585
מַעְיְנוּ־ 111
מֹעַל 64 i, 541
מֵעֲלוֹתֶהוּ 46 k, 390
מָעֳמָד 25 i, 155
מַעֲמִיד (in passive sense) 642
מְעָרַת 52 i, 462
מַפְתֵּחַ—מִפְתַּח 58 d, 493
מִפְתֵּיהָ (sing.) 41 c, 342
מְצֵאן 39 c
מֹצֵאת, מֹצְאֵת 39 d, 205, 295 a

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

מַצְּבוֹתָם 45 *j*, *379*
מְצָדוֹת 63 *y*, *533*
מָצוּק 58 *h*, *498*, 63 *f*
מְצֻיָּדוֹ (for מְצוּדוֹ) 78 *b*
מֵצַל 38 *r*, 64 *g*, *539 a*
מִצְעִירָה 58 *a*, *491*, *532*.
מֵצַר 64 *g*, *539 a*
מִקְדָּשׁ 16 *a*, *52*, *84*
מִקְדָּשׁוֹ 58 *b*, *d*
מִקְדְּשֵׁיהֶם 58 *f*, *496*
מִקְדְּשֵׁכֶם 24 *d*
מַקְהֵלִים 58 *d*
מִקְוֵא 66 *f'*
מְקוֹנֶנֶת 24 *e*, 26, *160*
מְקַטְּרִים (fem. plur.) 45 *i*, *377*
מַקַּל־, מַקְלוֹת 48 *a*
מְקַלְלָתִי (in some texts מְקַלְלַתִי) 24 *f*, *141*
מִקְצָת (cstr.) 45 *a*
מִקְרֶה 16 *a*, *52*, *84*
מְקַרְקַר 42 *e*, *356*
מָרָא 7 *s* (*c*), *59*
מַרְאַיִךְ (sing.) *570*
מְרַאשׁוֹתֵי 45 *j*, 52 *j*, *463*
מְרַאֲשֹׁתָיו 58 *f*, *495*
מִרְגְּזֵךְ 75 *a*
מֻרְדָּה *632*
מִרְדּוֹף 75 *a*, *621 a*
מָרוֹ 40 *f*, *305*
*מֶרְחָץ, מֶרְחֲצָאוֹת *68*, *471*
מֹרֶךְ 64 *i*, *541*
מֶרְכָּבָה *68*
*מֶרְכָּז *68*
מֵרֵעֵהוּ 46 *k*, *390*, 66 *o*, *557*
מְרֵעֵהוּ (in our text מֵרֵעֵהוּ) 660, *557*
מְרַפֵּא (=מְרַפֶּה) 39 *a*
מָרַת (in our text מָרַּת) 64 *t*
מֵשׁוֹר 61 *a*, *508*
מְשִׁיבוֹ (Inf.) 63 *p*, *524*
מִשֵּׁתוֹ 39 *j*
מְשׂוֹשֵׂךְ 63 *f*
מָשְׁחָת *155*
מִשְׁחַת 25 *i*, *155*
מִשְׁכּוּ 18 *d*, *93*
מַשְׂכִּימֵי 45 *b*, *371*
מִשְׁלַח 40 *e*, *304*, 78 *d*, *638*
מְשֻׁלָּשׁ 69 *d*, *596*
*מִשְׁנָיוֹת *471*
מִשְׁפַּט (abs.) 58 *b*
מִשְׁפְּטֵי 26 *a*
מֶשֶׁק 64 *h*, *540*
מַשָּׁק 64 *k*
מְשָׁרַת 6 *c*, *207 a*
מִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתֶם 40 *h'* (*c*), *339*
מִשְׁתֵּי, מִשְׁתֵּים 5 *a*
מִשְׁתֵּיהֶם (sing.) *570*
מֵת 37 *b*, *241*
מְתוֹם 56 *l*, *487*
מִתְחַבְּרָה 42 *b*, *350*
מַתְּלָאָה *532*, 66 *a'*
מְתַעְתְּעִים 42 *d* (*c*)

נֵאוָה *341*
נִאֵץ 24 *a*, *131*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

נָאָצָה, נָאָצוֹת 48 b, 422, 53 b
נָאָרִים 38 n, 286
נָבְזָה 38 v
נָבְלָה 38 v, 292
נְבַלָּתִי, נִבְלָתִי 53 c
נָבְקָה 38 v, 292
*נִבְרֶכֶת 296
נִגְאֲלוּ 23 l, 124
נֶגְבָּה 47 s
נְגֹהוֹת 47 d', 415
נָגֹזּוּ 38 j, 280 a
נָגֹלּוּ 38 j, 280 a
נֶדֶה 66 n, 556
נִדְּחוּ 23 h°
נִדְּחֵי 23 h°, 122
נִדְּחֵךְ 23 h
נִדְמָה 38 d, v, 273
נְדָנֶיךְ (from נֵדֶה) 38 a,
66 n, 556
נוּגֵי 40 g', 329
נָוָה (for נָאוָה) 341
נוֹטֵיהֶם (sing.) 45 g, 375
נוּלְדוּ 7 c, 24 j, 36 g, 214
נוֹצַר (אֵל) 23 b°
נוֹצְצִים 37 v
נוֹשָׁבָה 60 a
נִזְדַּכַּךְ 27 c, 164
נִזְדַּמֵּן 27 c, 164
נָזֹלוּ 3 b, 16 f, 84
נֹחַ 7 q, 258 a
נֶחְבְּאִים 23 h, 121, 39 f
נַחְבֵּאתָ 23 j, 39 e
נֶחְבָּה 39 e, 297
נִחָל 38 j, 281
נַחְלָה 47 b'
נָחֵלּוּ 38 j, 281
נַחֲלָת 45 a, 366
נִחַלְתְּ 273, 281, 38 j
נָחָמָה 48 b, 422
נָחָמִים 36 n, 231
נַחַנְתְּ 38 j, 281
נִחַר 38 j, 281
נֶחְשְׁתִּי (in our text נְחָשְׁתִּי)
54 c
נִחַת 38 j, 281
נַחַת 63 p, 525
נִחִתִּים 49 g, 435
נָטִיו 40 a, 301
נִטְמְאִים 23 h, 121
*נִידּוֹן 248
*נִיזּוֹנֶת 248
נִיתָם 40 g', 328
נִירוּ 251
נֵירִי 63 c
נֶכְדִי 408
נִכְחוֹ 16, 93, 177
נְכֹחוֹת 47 d', 415
נֵכִים 66 b, 548
נֵכַר־ 47 b
נִמְבְזָה 66 k', 571
נִמּוֹל 23 g, 120
נִמֹּלוּ, נִמֹּלִים, נְמַלְתֶּם 187 a
נָמֵס 38 j, 280 a
נָסְבָה 38 v, 292
נָסַבָּה 38 j, 280 a
נִסִבָּה 296
נִסָּה־ 39 j, 300
נָסוֹג 187 a

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

נִסְעָה 6 *c*
נֶעֶבְדֵם *127*
נֵעוֹר 37 *h*, *248*
נְעוּרָיְכִי 46 *j*, *389*
נַעֲוַת 23 *h*, *123*
נֶעְכֶּרֶת *296*
נְפֹוצֶת 37 *k*, *249*
נְפוֹצוֹתָם 37 *i*
נִפְלָאת 39 *b*
נִפְלְאֲתָה 37 *t*, 39 *g*, *298*
נִפְלוֹ *156*, *177*
נִפְקָה *60 a*
נָצֹא תֵּצֵא 40 *g'*, *327*
נִצְטַדָּק 1 *c*, *27 c*, *163*
נִצְּרָה 16 *a*, *84*, 18 *c*, *92*
נִצְּרֶהָ *92*, 32 *e*
נָקֹד–נְקֻדִּים 49 *g*, *435*
נָקוֹם 37 *h*, *247*
נְקוּמֹתִי *271 a*
נָקֹשׁוּ 38 *j*, *280 a*
נֵרְדְּ 47 *s*, *410*
נִרְפאוּ *121*
נִרְפְּתָה 39*
נִשָּׂא 39 *j*
נִשֵּׂאת, נִשְׂאֵת *205*, 39 *d*, *295 a*
נִשֵּׂאת 39 *d*, *296*
(נָשְׂאוּ =) נָשׂוּ 39 *a*
נָשׂוּא 7 *a*, *47*, 39 *a*
נִשָּׂא 40 *n*
נִשְׁאֹל (Inf.) 23 *d*, *120*
נִשְׁבַּרְתִּי אֶת . . . 23 *b*, *117*
נִשַּׁדֵּנוּ 38 *k*, *282*
נַשֵּׁנִי 40 *g'*, *326*
נִשְׁתָּה 16 *a*, *84*
נִשְׁתְּוָה 23 *l*, *124*
נִשְׁתָּעָה 40 *k*, *307 b*
נָתַן 34 *l*
נִתְּנוּ 16 *c*, *84*
נִתְּעוּ 34 *n*, *193*
נָתְתָה 22 *d*

סְאָה (cstr.) 45 *a*, *367*
סַאסְאָה 7 *c*, *52*
סְבְכוֹ 51 *c*, *443*
סֻבָּלוֹ (in our text סֻבֳּלוֹ)
51 *c*, *443*
סַבֹּת *271 a*
סוֹחֵרָה 49 *c*, *429*
סוּפָתָה *298*
סוּרָה 37 *f*, *243*
סוּרֵי 37 *p*, 45 *d*, *373*
סוּרֵי 37 *f*, *243*
סוּתֹה *48*
סְחַרְחַר 42 *f* (*a*)
סִיגִים (cstr.) 45 *b*, *370*
סֻכֹּה 52 *b*, 64 *t*
סְלֻוּהָ *22*
סֶלָה 64 *c*, *537*
סְעָרָה 52 *h*
סָרִיס 50 *d*, *425*

עָב (cstr.) *63 d*
עֲבַטִּיט 90 *c*, *701*
עֲבֹת–עֲבֹתָה } 49 *g*, *435*
עֲבֹתוֹת } 49 *g*, *435*
עֲבֹתִים } 49 *g*, *435*
עֲדִיוֹת, עֵדְוֹת, 63 *s*, *531*
עֲדִיוֹת, עֵדְוֹתֶיךָ

עֲדֹתַי *380*, 63 *s*, *531*

עוֹן *159*

עֹל–עֻלּוֹ 47 *f'*

עוֹלֵל *239*

עֲוֹנֹכֵי 46 *d*, *385*

עוּצוּ (in our text עֻצוּ)
36 *k*, *217*

עוּרָה (in our text עוּרָה)
37 *f*, *243*

עוֹרִים 48 *a*

עֹשֵׂי, עֹשָׂיו, עֹשַׂיִךְ 45 *g*, *375*, 82*e*,
653 a

עֶזְרָה *48*, 46 *e*, *386*

עֶזְרַת–עֶזְרָתָה 45 *a*, 365

עֹטְיָה 40 *m*

עַיִן 45 *f*, *374*

עֵינֵהוּ 46 *k*, *390*

עִירֹה *48*, 63 *b*

עֲיָרִים 63 *a*, *511*

עֵירֹם, עֵירֻמִּים 50 *h*, *k*, *439*

עֹלוֹת 63 *q*, *526*

עַל, עָלַי 45 *k*, *382*, *614*

עֻלְפֶּה (in our text עֻלְפֶּה)
24 *h*

עִמָּדִי 74 *e*, *620*

עַמִּי (plur.) 45 *c*, *372*

עִנְבֵי *84*, 47 *c*

עַנְוָה (cstr.) 45 *a*, *367*

עֱנוּת 66 *p'*, *574*

עַצְּבֵי 31 *f*, *178*

עַצֶּבֶת *84*, 54 *d*

עָצוּם (in active sense)
108, 81 *b*

עֲצָתָיִךְ 45 *j*, *380*

עָקֵב 47 *i*

עִקְּבֵי 6 *b*, 16 *a*, *84*, 47 *i*

עִקְּשׁוּת *84*, 55 *b*

עֹרֶה (anomalously)
18 *d*, *94*

עָרוּ עָרוּ 40 *v*

עֲרוּךְ 22 *w*

עֲרוּמִּים 7 *c*, *52*

עֶרְיָה־בֹשֶׁת 45 *a*, *367*

עָרִים 63 *a*, *511*, *514*

עֶרְכָּה 18 *c*, *92*

עֲרֵלוֹת 52 *g*, *460*

עָרֹם–עֲרֻמִּים 49 *g*, *435*

עָשֹׂה 40 *d*, *305*, 78 *d*

עֲשֵׂה (Inf.) 40 *d*, *303*

עֲשָׂהאֵל *48*

עָשָׂהוּ *305*

עָשׂוֹ 40 *f*, *305*

עָשׂוֹ *305*

עֶשְׂרִים 69 *i*, *601*

עֲשֹׂת 22 *b*, *207 a*, 40 *b*,
302

עֲשִׂיתִיךָ 28 *a*, *168*, 83 *b*, *658*

עָשָׁן *397*

עַשְׁתֵּי 69 *h*, *599*

פַּאֲרֵי 47 *o*, *407*

פְּדָהצוּר *48*

פַּדַּן, פַּדֶּנָה 48 *c*, *427*

פֹּה 46 *e*, *g*, *386* (*see*
also פִּי)

פּוֹנֶת (abs.) 45 *a*

פּוֹנַי (from פָּנָה) 38 *a*,
51 *h*, *448*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

פָּחָה–פַּחֲוֹת 66 *v'*, *582*
פַּחַת 66 *v'*, *582*
פִּי, פִּים, פִּיוֹת, פִּיפִיּוֹת 66 *q*, *561*
*פֹּל (Imp. of נפל) 34 *g*
פֶּלְאִי, פֶּלְיא (in our text פֶּלְאִי) 51 *g*, *446 a*, 65 *c*,
פֶּלֶג 24 *a*, *133*
פִּנָּה 63 *t*
פְּנוּאֵל–פְּנִיאֵל *16*
פָּעַל 15 *a*, *b*, *80*, *104*
פְּעָמֶיךָ 47 *u*
פְּקַח קֹחַ (in our text פְּקַח־קֹחַ) 57 *q*
פָּרָה 66 *u'*, *580*
פֹּרִיָּה 40 *n*
פְּרִיהֶן 46 *g*
פָּרֹכֶת, *פַּרְכִיּוֹת 53 *j*, *470*
*פַּרְפְּרִיּוֹת 53 *j*, *471*
פָּרַשׁ 47 *f*, *395*
פַּרְשֵׁז 42 *e* (*a*), *347*
פָּרָשַׁת, *פָּרָשִׁיּוֹת 53 *a*, *465*, *471*
פֹּרָת 40 *n*
פִּשְׁטָה (anomalously) 18 *d*, *94*
פִּשְׁתִּים 52 *b*, *452*
*פִּשְׁתָּן 52 *b*
פְּתָאִים 66 *h*
פֶּתְחָה 47 *s*
פְּתַיּוֹת *394*, 55 *c*

צְאוּ 7 *h*, *52*
צְאֶנָה (in our text צְאֶינָה) 36 *m*, *224*

צֵאת 36 *o*, 62 *j*
צְבָאִים 66 *h*
צָדָה (cstr.) 45 *a*, *367*
צָדוּ (in our text צָדוּ) 37 *d*
צִידֹנִין 45 *f*, *374*
צַדְקָתֵךְ 24 *a*
צַוָּאר 48 *c*
צַוְּארֵי 7 *c*, 48 *e*
צוֹר (verb) 37 *f*
צַוָּרִם 48 *c*
צִוַּתָּה 29 *e*
צִידוֹנִי 45 *c*, *372*
צִים 66 *q*
צֵלַע 47 *b*
צִמְתַתוּנִי 24 *f*, *139*
צִפִּיָּה 40 *n*
צִפֳּרִים 50 *h*, *469*
צִצִּים 63 *a*, *512*
צָקוּן 22 *i*, *106*, 36 *l*

קָאם 37 *b*, *241*
קֵבָה 66 *u'*, *579 a*
קֵבֹה 38 *h*, *386*
קָבָה־לִּי 7 *j*, 38 *f*, *276*
קָבָל, קָבֳלוֹ, קָבָלִי 49 *e*, *432*
קֳבָתָהּ 66 *w'*
קָדְמָה 47 *s*
קֳדָשִׁים, קֳדָשִׁים 47 *a'*, *412 a*
קֹהֶלֶת 82 *d*, *648*
קָו־תֹהוּ (in our text קַו־תֹהוּ) 7 *e*, 66 *r*
קוֹבַע 49 *a*
קוֹמָה 37 *f*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

קוֹמְים *37 p (b), 255, 258 a*
קָח (for לָקַח) 34 *m*, *211*
קָחָם (for לְקָחָם) 34 *m*, *192*
קְחַת־ 34 *m*
קֶסָבְךָ 49 *e*, *432*
קְסָלַתּוּ 30 *b*, *172*, *182*
קֶסֶנִּי 49 *e*, *432*
קְטַנִּים 47 *e*, *394*
קְיוּ 37 *s*
קֹל 64 *a*, *534*
*קְלִיּוֹת 66 *i*
קְלָלַת 6 *d*
קָם–קַמְתִּי 37 *b*, *241–2*
קָמָה (plur. f.) *650 a*
קַמּוֹהִי (Aram.) 27 *c*
קָמֲלוּ 16 *b*, *84*
קָמְצוּ 47 *z*
קִמְּשׂוֹנִים 56 *f*
קְנֹה 40 *d*, *305*
קְנִצֵּי (abs.) 45 *b*, *371*
קֶסֶמִי־ 18 *d*
קְעָרוֹתָיו 7 *h*, *52*, 52 *i*
קָצֶה 66 *n*, *555*
קְצוֹת 66 *u'*, *578*
קְצָפְךָ 47 *w*
קְרָאָהוּ 39 *a*
קְרֹאת 39 *h*
קֹרְאִים *121*, 39 *h*
קְרָאֶן 18 *d*, 39 *c*, *295*
קְרַאן (in our text קְרֶאןָ), 18 *d*, 39 *c*, *294 a*
קָרָאת 22 *a*, *105*, 39 *b*
קָרְבָן 56 *c*, *484*
קִרְבֶּנָה *232*
קְרִיּוֹת 52 *c*, *454*
קְרָנַיִם *393*, 47 *u*
קַרְתָּן–קְרִיתַיִם *376*
קְשׁוֹת 66 *u'*, *578*
קֹשְׁטְ 47 *y*

רְאֹה 40 *d*, *305*
רְאֵה (Inf.) 40 *d*, *303*
רְאוּ (א with Dagesh) *58*
רָאוּ 40 *f*, *305*
רַאֲוָה 40 *d*, *301*
רָאוֹת 40 *f*, *305*
רְאִישׁוֹן *480*
רָאֲמָה 37 *b*, *241*
רִאשׁוֹן 56 *a*, *480*
רֹאשָׁיו *520*
רִאשֹׁנֹתֵיכֶם 52 *c*, *453*
רָאשִׁים *514*, 63 *e*, *520*
רֵאשִׁית 55 *i*, *478*
רֵאשֶׁךָ 63 *c*
רִבְבוֹת 6 *d*
רַבֵּה 40 *u*
רֹבוּ 38 *b* [b], *271*
רִבּוֹתַיִם 45 *j*
רַבַּת 45 *a*
רַבֹּתִי *111*
רְמָה (anomalously) 18 *d*, *94*
רָדוּפִי (in our text רְדוּפִי) 31 *e*
רֹדֵם 36 *n*, 41 *e*, *343*
רוֹעָה 37 *p (b)*, *258 a*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

רָזִי־לִי 66 *i*, *550*
רַחֲיִם 68 *a*, *590*
רֶחֶם 47 *x*
רֳטֲפַשׁ 42 *a*, *349*
רְי 66 *q*, *558*
רִיבֹּותָ 37 *l*, *251*
רַכּוּ 38 *b*
*רָכוּב (in active sense) 81 *d*, *642*
רֹמּוּ 38 *b*, *271*
רְמִיּ 40 *h*' (*a*)
רָנִּי 38 *f*
רַעֹה *48*, 7 *t* (*b*)
רְעוּתָה *584*
רֵעֲהוּ 46 *e*, *386*
רֹעִי 40 *l*
רְפָה 39 *a*
רְצָאתִי 7 *s*, 39 *a*
רָצוֹא 39 *a*
רַצִּי *636*
רָצִין 45 *f*, *374*
רָשׁוּ 37 *d*

שְׂאֵת *205*, 39 *j*
שִׂגְשֵׂג 42 *d* (*a*), *353*
שֶׂה—שֵׂה—שֵׂיוֹ 66 *q*, *562*
שׂוֹא 39 *j*
שָׂחוּ 66 *k*, *553*
שֵׂטִים 66 *b*, *548*
שִׂיא 61 *d*, *509*
שִׂיג 61 *d*, *509*
שְׂיֵהוּ 46 *e*, *386*
שִׂים *251*
שִׂישׂוּ *251*
שְׂכָה *48*, 52 *b*
שֶׂכְוִי 51 *g*, *446*
שְׂלָו—שַׂלְוִים 47 *p*, *406*
שְׂמֹאול, שְׂמֹאל 50 *b*, *435 a*
שָׂמוּ 37 *d*, *243*
שְׂמֵחַי 47 *i*
שִׂמְחַת (abs.) 45 *a*
שִׂנְאָתֵיךְ (in our text שִׂנְאָתֵיךְ) 45 *j*, *380*
שְׂעִפִּים 49 *g*, *435*
שֵׂעָר 47 *b*, *392*
שִׂפְתוֹת 66 *w*' *, *577*
שָׂרָתִי *111*

שֶׁ, שָׁ, שַׁ, שְׁ *see* אֲשֶׁר
שָׁאֹל 24 *a*, *130*
שְׁאֵלָתִי, שְׁאֶלָתִי 52 *a*, *451*, 53 *c*
שְׁאִלְתִּיהוּ, שְׁאִלְתִּיו 29 *f*
שְׁאֶלְתֶּם 22 *j*
שְׁאַסַיִךְ 7 *s*, *59*
שְׁבוּת 66 *p*', *573*
שַׁבֵּחַ (ptcp.) 24 *a*, *135*
שִׁבֹּלֶת, שִׁבֳּלִים *469*, 54 *e*
שְׁבַע *597*
שָׁבֻעוֹת, שְׁבֻעוֹת, שֳׁבֻעִים 49 *f*, *434*
שִׁבְעָנָה 69 *g*, *598*
שְׁבַעְתֶּם 69 *g*, *597*
שַׁבָּת—שַׁבַּתּוֹ 48 *c* *, *424*
שָׁדְדָה *22*, 24 *d*
שַׁדַּי 48 *c*, 51 *i*, *449*
שָׁוְא 47 *e*', *416*

שׁוֹב (Inf. for יָשׁוֹב) 36 *c*, *208*

שׁוּבָה 37 *f*, *243*

שׁוּבִי 37 p (*b*)

שׁוֹמֲמוֹת, שׁוֹמֵמִים 49 *c*, *429*, 53 *k*

שׁוֹמֵמִין 45 *f*, *374*

שׁוּק–שְׁוָקִים 63 *e*, *520*

שׁוֹר–שְׁוָרִים 63 *e*, *520*

שׁוֹשֵׁיתִי 40 *k'* (*f*), *340*

שׁוֹשַׁנִּים *394*, 49 *b*

שְׁחָדוּ 3 *f*

שַׁחַת 63 *p*, *525*

שָׁחוּט (in active sense) 81 *b*, *641*

שֶׁיוֹצָא 36 *m*

שֶׁילוֹנִי (from שִׁילֹה) 38 *a*, 51 *h*, *448*

שִׁירוּ *251*

שִׁית *251*

שְׁכוּנֵי (in active meaning) 81 *b*, *641*

שְׁכוּרַת

שִׁכְּלַתָּה 29 *g*

שְׁכֶם, שִׁכְמָה, שֶׁכְמָה 47 *q*, *408*

שְׁכֶמָה 47 *q*

שְׁכָנַי 22 *s*, *111*

שְׁכֶנְתָּהּ 54 *b*

שִׁכָּרוֹן 56 *f*

שֶׁל 66 *r*, *563*

שַׁלְוּ־בָהּ 7 *e*

שַׁלְוָתִי 7 *v* (*b*), *61 a*

שְׁלַח 24 *g*, *142*

שְׁלִישׁוֹ 49 *f*

שָׁלִישֵׁי (pl.) 45 *c*, *372*

שְׁלִישִׁים 49 *f*

שָׁלֵם 24 *a*

שִׁלְנִי (from שֶׁלָּה) 38 *a*, 51 *h*, *448*

שְׁלֹשׁ־ 69 *d*, *595*

שֵׁם, שֵׁמוֹת 66 *u*, *v*

שֵׁמוֹת 38 *e*, *274 a*

שָׁמַיִם 45 *k*, *381*, 68 *a*, *589*

שְׁמִכָה 46 *c*

שְׁמָמָה 7 *t* (*b*), *60 a*

שְׁמַעַן 18 *d*

שְׁמֻעָה 29 *g*, 32 *e*, *171*

שָׁמְרָה (Imp.) *22*, 18 *b*

שָׁמְרֵנִי *22*, 32 *c*

שָׁנָא 7 *s*, *59*

שְׁנָא 39 *a*

שְׁנֵי 51 *g*, *447*

שְׁנַיִם, שְׁנֵים עָשָׂר 45 *h*, *600*

שְׁנַת (in our text שְׁנַת) 45 *a*, 62 *j*, *510 a*

שעשע 42 *d* (*a*), *353*

שִׂפְתָה 22 *t*, *112*, 26 *a*

שְׁפָכָה 7 *t* (*b*) 60 *a*

שְׁפָנִים 47 *e*, *394*

שִׁפְעַת 45 *a*

שִׁפְרָה 42 *b*, *351*

שֶׁקֶת, שְׁקָתוֹת 3 *f* (*b*), 66 *w'*, *x'*, *583*, *583 a*

שְׁרָאשָׁי *58*

שְׁרוֹתֶיהָ 63 *q*, *528*

שֵׁרִיתִיךָ *200*, 37 *p* (*b*), *257*

שָׁרֶךְ, שָׁרֵךְ *58*

שֹׁרֶשׁ 26 *a*

שָׁרָשָׁיו 47 *a'*, *412 a*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

שַׁתָּה 37 *c*, *243*
שַׁתּוּ 37 *w*, *269*
שָׁתוֹתֶיהָ, שְׁתוֹתֵיהֶם 63 *q*, *529*
שְׁתַּיִם 5 *a*, *36*, 69 *c*, *594*
שְׁתֵּים, שְׁתֵּים עֶשְׂרֵה 45 *h*, *600*

תְּאֵהָבוּ 35 *h*, *205*
תְּאָכְלֵהוּ *144*, 26 *a*, 35 *g*, *204*
תֵּאָמַנָּה 6 *c*
תְּאֻנָּה 66 *x*, *568*
תְּאֵנִים 63 *t*
תְּאָסְפוּן (from יסף) 36 *p*, *235 a*
תֹּאסֵף 35 *b*
תֵּאָסֵף 40 *p*, *307 a*
תָּאֳרוּ see וְתָאֳרוּ
תֵּאתֶה 35 *f*, *201*
תָּבֵא 35 *b*
תָּבֹאתָה, תָּבוֹאתִי, תְּבוֹאָתְךָ 37 *t*, *261*
תְּבוּנָם 52 *b*, 63 *t*
תְּבִיאוּ *58*
תֶּבֶל 64 *n*, *544*
תִּבָּנֶה 40 *p*, *307 a*
תְּגִירֵן 40 *a*, *g'*
תַּגְמוּלוֹהִי 46 *k*
תִּדְהַר 59 *j*, *501 a*
תִּדְמִי *253*, 38 *l*
תִּדְעַל 59 *j*, *501 a*
תִּדְרוּ 6 *c*
תֹּהוּ 51 *f*, *444*
תִּהְיֶה 40 *k*, *307 a*
תְּהִלָּה 64 *m*, *543*, 66 *x*, *567*
תְּהַלֵּךְ 19 *c*
תְּהִלַּת 45 *a*, *366*
תְּהִלָּתֶךָ 45 *j*, *380*
תִּתְהַלְּלוּ *127*
תּוֹכַחְנָה 74 *e*
תּוֹכֵחוֹת 62 *i*
תּוֹמִיךְ 22 *o*, *109*, 30 *e*, *173*
תּוֹסִיפִי 66 *c''*, *587*
*תּוֹסֶפְתָּא *68*
תּוֹעֵבוֹת 53 *k*
תּוּקַד *234*
תּוּשַׁד 38 *t*
תּוּשִׁיָּה 66 *b''*, *586*
תֵּזְלִי 35 *f*, *202*
תַּזְנוּתָיִךְ 66 *c'*
תֵּחַד 35 *f*, *202*
תְּחוֹלֶלְכֶם 37 *v*
תֵּחַל 38 *p*, *287*
תַּחֲלוּאָיְכִי 46 *j*, *389*
תַּחֲנֹתִי 66 *c'*, *569*
תַּחַת 38 *l*, *283*
תַּחְתֶּנָּה 46 *l*
תַּחְתֵּנִי 46 *b*, *383*
תִּיכוֹן 62 *j*
תְּיֵלִילוּ 36 *i*, *216*
*תִּינוֹק, *תִּינֹקֶת 62 *g*
תִּשְׁמַעְנָה 35 *c*
תִּכְלָה 40 *k*
תְּלָאוּם 39 *a*
תִּלְבַּשְׁןָ 22 *n*
תְּלוּאִים 39 *a*
תְּלוּנוֹת 7 *c*, *52*
תִּלְכְּדוֹ 33 *e*
תְּמַחִי 40 *l*, *308*
תִּמָּלֵא 38 *a*, *270*
תַּמְנוּ, תָּמְנוּ 38 *a*, *c*, *270*, *272*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

תֶּמֶּס 64 *n*, *544*
תִּנְדֹּף *158*, 34 *d*
תְּנָה 77 *c*, *632*
תְּנַצְּרֶכָּה, תִּנְצְרֵנִי 34 *i*
תְּסַבֶּינָה *271 a*
תֹּסֵף 35 *b*, *235 a*
תָּעָבְדֵם 19 *d*, *127*
תַּעֲבוּרִי 19 *a*, 36 *k*
תַּעֲגַנָּה 40 *r*, *315*
תָּעוּ 40 *c*
תַּעֲלוּ 40 *o*, *312*
תְּעֻפָּה 20 *c*
תַּעֲשֶׂה 40 *k*, *307 a*
תַּעְשְׁרֶנָּה 25 *k*, *195*
*תָּפוּשׂ (in active sense) 81 *d*, *642*
תִּפְלָה 64 *m*, *542*
תְּפֵּסוֹת 49 *c*, *429*
תְּקוּמֶינָה *271 a*
תֵּקַל 38 *d*, *l*, *283*
תִּקְרֶאנָה 82 *d*, *651*
תִּרְאֶה 40 *k*, *307 a*
תִּרְאֶינָה 36 *n*, 40 *m*
*תַּרְבֵּץ 59 *e*
תִּרְגַּלְתִּי 25 *e*, *150*
תַּרְבּוּת–תַּרְבּוּיוֹת, תַּרְבּוּתִים 66 *c'*
תָּרוּ *37 d*, *243*
תְּרָמָה 66 *x*, *568*
תְּרֻמַּסְנָה 82 *d*, *651*
תָּרוֹנָה (in our text תָּרֹנָּה) 20 c
תִּרְפֶּינָה (=תִּרְפֶּאנָה) 39 *a*
תְּרַצְּחוּ *127*
תִּשָּׂאֶינָה (in our text תִּשֶּׂאינָה) 39 *j*
תִּשֶּׂנָה 39 *j*
תְּשׁוֹמֵם 38 *m*, *285*
תֵּשִׁי 40 *g'*, *325*
תְּשַׁלַּחְנָה 82 *d*, *651*
תֵּשַׁם 35 *f*, *201–2*
תִּשְׁמוּרֵם 19 *a*, 36 *k*
תִּשְׂמְטֶנָּה 36 *n*, *171*
תִּשְׁתָּע 40 *d'*
תִּתָּאוּ 40 *h'* (*g*), *341*
תִּתְאָו 40 *d'*
תִּתַּבָּר 38 *u*, *291*
תִּתְגָּר 40 *d'*
תַּתָּה 34 *l*, *211*
תִּתְחַר 40 *d'*, *322*
תִּתְחָרֶה 42 *b*, *350*
תִּתֹּם *253*, 38 *l*
תִּתֹּם 38 *l*
תִּתְּנוּ 33 *e*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

INDEX OF PASSAGES

(This index is limited to passages occurring in Chapter VI, *Syntactical Remarks*. The regular numbers refer to sections, the italic numbers to notes)

GENESIS

1 11....80, *639*
26....82 *e*, *653*
31....88 *a*
2 20....83 *c*, *660*
3 1....87 *a*, *678*
4 23....77 *b*, *629*, 83 *c*, *660*, 85 *o*, 89 *k*
7 11....85 *c*, *674*
8 5....78 *a*, *634*
9 10....85 *b*
12 1....85 *n*, *667*
15 2....89 *i*, *692*
18 28....85 *e*
19 9....88 *a*
15....85 *k*
20 13....85 *q*
22 4....86 *a*
24 31....81 *b*, *641*
25 31....85 *j*
33....85 *j*
26 7....85 *q*
27 24....87 *a*
27....79
30....78 *d*
28 10....89 *d*, *688*
30 16....88 *a*
31 29....90 *d*
32 6....82 *f*
36 24....86 *a*
37 4....83 *b*, *657*
14....83 *b*, *657*
38 33....78 *b*, *635*
24....85 *k*
39 4....89 *g*
40 3....84 *b*, *662*

GENESIS

41 1....77 *b*, *630*
57....90 *b*, *699*
42 7....89 *l*, *696*
10....86 *j*
27....88 *a*
30....89 *l*, *696*
43 15....90 *c*
44 19....85 *v*, *670–1*
46 27....88 *d*
48 2....89 *j*, *693*

EXODUS

1 5....86 *i*
9....81 *b*, *641*
10....82 *d*, *651*
2 6....83 *a*, *655*
3 11....*628*
4 23....89 *k*
7 11....83 *a*, *656*
8 2....82 *f*
10 3....82 *d*, *651*
11 4....85 *j*
12 46....*664*
14 27....86 *c*, *674*
15 1....77 *b*
9....83 *b*, *657*, 89 *f*, *689*
16 20....85 *c*, *674*
18 20....89 *g*
23....86 *f*
19 12....89 *e*
20 8....78 *a*, *634*
21 15....86 *b*
22....82 *c*
22 10....82 *e*, *653*

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Exodus

24 1....83 *c*, *660*
28 11....90 *c*
29 3....90 *c*
30 20....89 *b*, *687*
34....85 *v*
34 18....89 *c*
25....89 *m*, *697*
35 5....83 *a*, *655*

Leviticus

5 21....80, *639*
7 11....89 *j*, *693*
16....86 *a*
8 32....85 *b*
9 22....86 *c*, *674*
10 19....85 *k*
13 9....82 *i*
47....*664*
57....83 *a*, *655*
16 22....85 *c*
20 14....82 *c*
21 1....80
4....89 *d*, *687*
21 21....*664*
23 16....85 *u*
24 20....85 *g*
25 33....82 *g*
26 4....86 *f*
37....*665*
27 11....81 *e*
23....88 *b*

Numbers

10 2....78 *d*, *638*
21....90 *f*
12 1....82 *h*
13 2....85 *n*, *667*
15 15....88 *e*
18 7....85 *q*, *669*
20 10....87 *b*, *679*
24....85 *o*
21 17....77 *b*
22 18....89 *l*, *696*
23 10....78 *d*, *637–8*
25 1....88 *c*
28 4....88 *a*, *681*
30 3....78 *a*, *634*
31 28....90 *c*

Deuteronomy

5 12....78 *a*, *634*
11 19....*664*
15 17....90 *f*
17 12....85 *q*
18 8....85 *v*
22 23....82 *b*, *647*
24 6....89 *i*, *692*
32 1....88 *e*
50....77 *c*
33 2....85 *t*
6....89 *h*

Joshua

1 2....83 *a*, *656*
2 4....82 *d*, *652*
3 14....88 *b*, *682*
7 2....88 *c*
21....88 *b*
8 33....88 *b*
10 13....89 *e*
24....88 *d*
15 19....83 *b*, *657*
22 19....85 *n*, *667*
20....80, *639*
24 19....82 *e*, *653*

Judges

1 7....*628*
8....90 *d*
4 21....86 *c*, *674*
5 22....81 *f*
23....78 *b*
24....82 *e*, 85 *s*
26....82 *d*, *651*
27....89 *f*, *689*
8 10....88 *c*
11....81 *b*, *641*
18....85 *v*, *670–1*
10 8....85 *b*

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

JUDGES

11 31....86 *b*
39....89 *l*
12 7....82 *c*
16 14....88 *b*
18 8....89 *i*, *692*
21 21....82 *b*

1 SAMUEL

1 7....85 *d*
2 4....82 *i*
14....*664*
16....78 *b*
27....87 *b*, *679*
33....89 *i*, *692*
3 3....90 *e*
6 4....82 *a*, *645*
9 13....85 *j*
24....88 *d*
10 12....89 *l*
12 11....83 *c*, *660*
14 4....85 *k*, *665*
18....86 *i*
15....82 *d*, *651*
24....82 *f*
30....87 *a*
15 23....89 *c*
17 12....89 *i*, *692*
58....88 *e*
18 14....85 *o*
21....82 *c*
23....78 *c*
20 30....85 *o*
41....85 *p*
21 14....83 *a*, *655*
23 15,16..88 *c*
22....78 *b*, *635*
25 27....82 *b*, *647*
30 8....87 *a*

2 SAMUEL

1 19....88 *e*
21....84 *b*, *662*
2 22....85 *h*, *667*
26....89 *l*
3 18....78 *a*, *634*
30....85 *m*, *666*
37....78 *c*
4 2....89 *d*, *687*
6 3....88 *a*
13 20....86 *a*, *672*
26....86 *h*, *677*
39....82 *b*, *650*
14 6....83 *a*, *655*
16 20....82 *e*, *653*
18 29....87 *a*
23 5....81 *f*
14....89 *e*
24 9....84 *a*
16....88 *c*

1 KINGS

1 24....87 *a*
2 26....89 *i*, *692*
3 15....89 *d*, *687*
11 9....88 *d*
14 24....88 *b*
17 16....82 *i*
21 19....87 *b*, *679*

2 KINGS

1 13....90 *c*
3 23....78 *b*
5 17....86 *h*, *677*
6 5....88 *a*
10....89 *l*, *695*
7 2....85 *r*
9 30....90 *d*
15 16....88 *b*
16 8....89 *b*, *687*
18 31....89 *i*, *692*

ISAIAH

1 12....89 *d*, *687*
13....86 *i*
26....*665*
29....82 *a*, *644–5*
3 25....89 *h*, *690*
6 2....77 *b*
4....77 *b*
9....78 *b*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Isaiah

8 6....84 b, 662
9 12....88 b, 683
13 5....86 g
16 10....693
19 11....84 a, 661
21 9....639
22 18....80, 639
24 2....85 v, 670–1, 88 b
19....78 b
25 12....84 a, 661
26 3....81 b, 641
11....90 b
27 7....642
28 3....82 d, 651
4....693
9....84 b, 662
30 20....89 k
33 2....82 a, 645
35 1....83 b, 657, 659
3....79
40 30....78 b
41 26....85 u
42 5....82 e, 653–3a, 89 g
8....89 h, 690
48 16....86 g
52 11....639
54 5....82 e, 653–3a
55 10....81 f
14....77 c
56 10....84 b, 662
60 2....86 g
7....90 c
64 4....86 c, 674
65 5....83 b, 657
20....85 u
66 22....77 b
23....85 d

Jeremiah

2 2....78 a, 634
17....78 c
19....78 c
31....88 e
3 5....86 d, 675
20....85 t
4 19....80
6 15....87 a
7 20....82 h
21....79
10 6....85 u
20....83 b, 657
22....82 i
11 19....689
12 1....80, 639
13 18....79
14 5....78 a, 634
17 18....90 c
20 7....83 b, 657
10....83 b, 657
22 10....78 b
23 22....86 f
25 15....88 b, 682
36....88 b
27 8....78 d
30 12....85 m, 666
49 24....82 h

Ezekiel

1 14....78 a, 634
3 20....83 a, 655
6 8....78 c, 636
8 3....89 i, 692
8....636
10 9....88 a
11 7....78 a, 634
13 2....84 b, 662
18....85 m^a, 666a
16 4....78 b
29....699
31....78 c, 636
17 9....78 d, 638
20 39....79
21 16....90 b
22 29....80, 639
24 17....90 c
26 17....88 d
29 3....83 b, 657–8
33 26....82 b
36 10....636
37 7....82 b
9....88 e
39 11....90 c
40 31....88 a

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ezekiel

43 27....85 *b*
45 16....88 *b*, *682*
46 6....82 *e*

Hosea

6 6....85 *s*
6 9....*636*
7 5....84 *b*, *662*
8 2....90 *c*
12 7....85 *c*
13 9....85 *v*
14 3....90 *b*

Amos

4 4....79
5 16....90 *e*
6 12....89 *j*, *693*

Obadiah

1 4....77 *c*

Micah

2 7....88 *e*
7 19....82 *a*, *645*

Habakuk

2 6....90 *c*, *701*
3 11....89 *f*, *689*

Zephania

3 20....78 *a*, *634*

Haggai

2 15....85 *u*

Zacharia

1 2....80, *639*
4 10....89 *l*, *696*
9 9....82 *c*

Malachi

2 15....82 *a*, *645*

Psalms

5 5....83 *b*, *657*
12....84 *b*, *662*
7 5....86 *j*
8 2....77 *c*, *632*
9 5....85 *o*
7....88 *e*
18....89 *d*, *688*
10 4....89 *b*, *687*
14....*628*
11 7....90 *c*
13 5....83 *b*, *657*
19 11....85 *s*
32 6....82 *i*
33 1....85 *c*
34 18....90 *f*
36 6....85 *h*
37 31....82 *d*, *651*
44 6....85 *f*
45 6....90 *e*
7....89 *h*, *690–1*
8....85 *s*
53 6....83 *b*, *657*, 90 *e*
56 8....87 *a*
59 16....86 *d*, *675*
63 6....86 *d*, *675*
68 8....86 *e*
10....89 *k*, *694*
14....90 *c*
30....85 *t*
31....*636*
74 3....90 *b*
7....90 *d*
76 7....86 *a*, *672*
77 2....78 *c*, *634*
80 6....90 *d*, *702*
9....77 *b*, *629*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Psalms

81 11....88 *b*, *683*
83 12....83 *a*, *655*
87 7....85 *v*
88 4....85 *b*
89 51....90 *c*
101 4....78 *d*
103 14....*642*
104 6....90 *c*, *700*
109 4....89 *i*, *692*
119 8....90 *b*
121 1....85 *r*
138 2....90 *c*
139 2....85 *m*, *666*
149 2....82 *e*, *653–3a*

Proverbs

5 14....85 *j*
22....83 *a*, *655*
9 5....85 *b*
14....85 *p*
11 22....89 *c*
13 4....83 *a*, *656*
14 13....83 *a*, *656*
25 25....86 *e*
27 15....86 *e*
28 16....89 *m*

Job

2 13....85 *o*, *668*
12 11....86 *e*
12....89 *b*, *687*
13....85 *o*, *668*
14 10....86 *c*, *674*
18 2....82 *e*, *653*
19 15....82 *h*
20 17....84 *a*, *661*
24 10....81 *e*, *f*
30 28....81 *f*
32 9....89 *h*, *690*
35 10....82 *e*, *653–3a*
37 18....87 *a*
38 21....90 *d*
39 29....85 *q*, *669*

Canticles

5 6....89 *f*, *689*
13....88 *e*

Ruth

1 8....82 *b*
2 17....85 *k*
4 4....82 *a*, *645*

Lamentations

1 1....85 *j*
4 14....85 *h*
21....79

Ecclesiastes

2 6....81 *f*
4 10....82 *c*
12....88 *a*
5 19....90 *b*
7 27....82 *b*, *648*
9 9....82 *g*, *654*
10 10....86 *f*
15....82 *b*, *649*
11 3....84 *b*, *662*
9....79
12 8....88 *c*

Esther

1 1....86 *a*
20....82 *b*
3 2....85 *q*
8....83 *a*, *656*
6 8....90 *b*
7 3....82 *h*
4....85 *q*
9 19....78 *d*, *638*
22....78 *d*, *638*
23....82 *d*, *651*
29....82 *h*

Daniel

2 36....82 *e*, *653*
8 13....90 *c*

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

DANIEL

9 17....83 *c*, *660*
11 6....88 *b*, *683*

EZRA

10 9....88 *a*
14....85 *r*, 88 *b*
17....88 *d*
44....89 *h*, *690*

NEHEMIAH

1 4....*213*
2 13....85 *g*
13 22....*628*

1 CHRONICLES

3 2....85 *m*, *666*
15 13....85 *q*, *669*
26 17....89 *d*, *688*
28....88 *d*
29 8....88 *d*

2 CHRONICLES

1 4....88 *d*
15 11....89 *g*
18 34....*642*
28 9....85 *r*
29 36....88 *d*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN